

The
**CATHOLIC
CRISIS**

by

GEORGE SELDES

AUTHOR OF

The **VATICAN**

YESTERDAY TODAY TOMORROW

\$3.00

THE CATHOLIC CRISIS

by George Seldes

Author of *THE VATICAN Yesterday*
Today Tomorrow

By the phrase "The Catholic Crisis" Mr. Seldes means simply that the oldest and most powerful institution in the world, the Roman Catholic Church and its state, Vatican City, face the same problem which the world's nations face and which also confronts every thinking man and woman in the world. This question is: Reaction or Progress.

The civil war in Spain, where the Catholic hierarchy took the side of Franco (and his allies Hitler and Mussolini) while in Germany the Church was fighting Hitler, is but one indication of the crisis. Another was suggested by the Gallup poll, where the hierarchy's frequent pronouncements that all Catholics were on the side of Franco were rebutted by a vote showing that no more than 38 percent of the Catholics of this country favored the Fascist leader.

Has the Church a link with Fascism? Does Father Coughlin really represent the Church in his anti-Semitic orations? Seldes surveys the entire American scene: What is the nature of Catholic influence on national and city politics, on the press,

(Continued on back flap)

(Continued from front flap)

the movies, and civil liberties? What is its part in education and labor? Seldes approaches these and other questions with impressive documentation. Finally the book tells of the very serious Catholic crisis in other parts of the world, in Mexico, Canada, Latin-America, and in Europe; and shows that everywhere the same problem, Reaction or Progress, confronts the most powerful institution in the world today.

Here is an objective study of critical problems which, while revealing facets of Catholic reaction, is also emphatic in evidence of the Catholic liberalism that opposes them. This fact, indeed, is one of the main points of the book because it is this division between the reactionary leadership and the progressive elements that makes for a Catholic crisis in America.

Selected Chapter Headings

"Catholic Liaison with Fascism", "Catholics and anti-Semitism", "Catholic Reactionary Pressures", "Catholics and Civil Liberties", "Who Speaks for the Church—Coughlin?", "Catholic Pressure in Politics", "Catholics and Political Machines", "Catholic Pressure on the Press", "The Catholic Press", "Catholic Pressure on the Movies", "The Church in Europe and South America", "Reactionaries of the World Unite".

THE CATHOLIC CRISIS

by

GEORGE SELDES

Author of THE VATICAN: YESTERDAY—TODAY—TOMORROW,
LORDS OF THE PRESS, *etc.*

NEW YORK
JULIAN MESSNER, INC.

PUBLISHED BY JULIAN MESSNER, INC.
8 WEST 40TH STREET, NEW YORK 18, N. Y.

COPYRIGHT 1939, 1945
BY GEORGE SELDES

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Contents

	PAGE
Preface to the New Edition	1
Foreword	3

PART I

FASCISM, DEMOCRACY, AND THE CHURCH

CHAPTER

1. Catholic Liaison With Fascism	7
2. Catholics and Anti-Semitism	22
3. Catholic Reactionary Pressures	48
4. Catholics and Civil Liberties	77
5. Who Speaks for the Church?—Coughlin?	100

PART II

CATHOLIC ACTIONS—AND REACTIONS

6. Catholic Pressure in Politics	130
7. Catholics and Political Machines	155
8. Catholic Pressure on the Press	184
9. Catholic Pressure on the Movies	211

PART III

THE VATICAN AND THE WORLD

10. The Fascist Internationale	240
11. Catholic States and Parties	269
12. The Church in Canada and Latin America	287
13. The Way Out of the Crisis	325

PART IV

THE VATICAN SURVIVES GLOBAL WAR

14. Catholics and the Post-Fascist Era	351
--	-----

Preface to the New Edition

THE end of the Fascist Axis in Europe, May 8, 1945, was also a most important day in the history of the Vatican and the Catholic Church. The Church and its State had been involved in the Fascist movement from its very beginning, supporting it frequently, attacking it sometimes, as this book details with documentary evidence.

The first edition of *The Catholic Crisis* was published in 1939, and emphasized the relationship of the Church to the Spanish War, the "dress rehearsal" of the Fascist attempt to conquer the world. I attempted to state the facts impartially. Because the subject is "controversial," because it is usually taboo in newspapers and magazines, it is rarely mentioned, and most discussions are from a prejudiced viewpoint.

An opportunity was given pros and antis to attack this volume in 1939. One or two minor errors have been pointed out and corrected. But no important page has been challenged.

This has been a source of great satisfaction to the author and the inspiration to bring the book up to date—to take the Vatican through the dark ages of Fascism.

The policy of the Roman Catholic Church at a time it ruled its own states and was the official church of Catholic nations, has been frankly and frequently expressed by the Popes, and must be known to every Catholic and non-Catholic alike who wants to understand its political actions. It is

explained in the first chapter of *The Vatican: Yesterday Today Tomorrow*: "The Church has never neglected to adapt itself to the genius of nations," the great Pope Leo XIII said in his famous encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, half a century ago, to which the present Pope (Pius XI) in 1933 added: "The Church accommodates herself to all forms of governments and civil institutions, provided the right of God and the Christian conscience is left intact."

Fascism, headed by atheists, renegades, murderers, fanatics, cowards and brutes, signed concordats providing for "the right of God and the Christian conscience." Several are still in force, others were broken before the Global War began. Mussolini was openly called "the man sent by Providence" by a Pope who knew that Mussolini was still an atheist, still breaking the majority of the Ten Commandments, and planning his private murders and his brutal wars. Cardinals blessed fascist airplanes and tanks and guns.

And now the Fascist International—if not all Fascism—has been defeated on the battlefields at a cost of 100,000,000 dead (according to Vansittart), and not only is the Fascist party in each defeated state dead and outlawed, but its real meaning is known, and new regimes are coming into power which will not tolerate reaction under any name.

The Vatican and the Catholic Church are adapting themselves to this new genius of nations.

This is one of the most significant movements in world history. The whole episode of Fascism and Catholicism is of tremendous importance; it is a subject on which light should be shed, and the author hopes that every reader of this volume will help to break the conspiracy of silence which has hung like the black shrouds of Fascism over this great controversy.

GEORGE SELDES.

V-E Day, 1945.

Foreword

WHAT I am attempting to do here is to follow the Euripidean warning to "let the facts speak for themselves," and therefore I owe an apology to no one.

But perhaps a short explanation is necessary.

When non-Catholic writers or the more liberal and progressive Catholics say or write anything in serious and objective criticism of the Roman Catholic Church, the Vatican State, the hierarchy, they usually begin self-consciously with an apology. They usually start their first page with an answer to the Count De Maistre, champion of the Papacy, who insisted that no man not a member of the Church should take pen in hand unless he stopped on the title page to answer the questions: "Who are you? For whom do you speak?"

At the suggestion of several Catholic friends who have helped with this book and read it carefully, I reply:

1. I am the author of *The Vatican: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow*, a historical work telling the human story as well as the political policies of this institution. It was intended originally to be no more than a translation of a French manuscript for Harper's, but I became so interested in the subject that I did an enormous amount of research, corrected an enormous amount of errors, and wrote between 75 and 80 per cent of the manuscript. The Catholic Book Club thought so highly of it that it made it one of its monthly

selections, and it received nothing but recommendation in the Catholic and Protestant press of the world.

2. I speak for no one. But I realize that although 80 or 90 per cent of the material in this book is documented fact, there must be in all presentation of facts a method which betrays an attitude. Very well then. If I speak for anyone, it is *for* the progressive and democratic majority—I hope it is still a majority—in this country, and *against* the reactionary, obscurantist and fascist elements which may still be the minority but nevertheless the most dangerous elements, both in America and in the rest of the free world which still opposes the Fascintern.

I am also aware that the critic of anything Catholic may be accused of attempting "to separate American lay Catholics from their bishops," "to spread suspicion and distrust and hatred of the leaders of the Catholic Church in this country," of trying to drive a wedge between the bishops and the leaders of the masses, and the laity. These are charges Michael Williams, then editor of *The Commonweal*, made on one occasion.

Of course, it would be useless to disclaim any such purpose. It would be presumption on my part even to entertain the thought that anything I might write would have any such effect. But the facts do speak for themselves. Take, for example, the question of sides in the Spanish War: the writers of America voted some 98 per cent against Franco and Fascism, and there were Catholics among them; the American people were a majority against Franco, and to the great surprise of everyone, including anti-Fascists, it was found that the Catholic majority was not for Franco either. Well, their cardinals and bishops were about 98 per cent for Franco, and the laity, the Catholic masses, were not for Franco. It was Fascism, not writers and critics, which was driving the great wedge there.

For some people—not the Spanish—the war in Spain is over, but it is still the most living issue for millions of men and women in America who are at all aware of what that war was about, what it means to all of us in free countries, how it affects the future of democracy, the liberties of all peoples. Fascist propagandists, clerical and lay, American and European, have tried to confuse the issue with race hatred and Red baiting. The war was not a religious war, nor an anti-Marxist war. The soldiers of the International Brigade said to the Republicans who thanked them for coming to fight in Spain: "Don't thank us; we are not fighting for you; we are fighting for ourselves." It was a war of Democracy versus Fascism, the first openly so fought, and it involved the minds and emotions of all intelligent people everywhere. The war in Spain was also one of the most decisive moments in the history of the Vatican. For it and for all who took sides, that war is not over, and the issues it raised will be fought over for generations.

They are still being fought in the newspapers, in the pulpits, on platforms, over the radio, in the movies, everywhere where there is communication between people, in countries where communication is still free. The Second European War, with its complicated alignments, and the temporary break of the fascist axis, has not changed the situation, although it has postponed the ultimate conflict between reaction and progress. Fascism still is the aggressor, is still determined to destroy democracy, still intends to destroy our culture, our liberties, and our lives, if necessary, and it is therefore in self-defense that every man and institution must take a stand before it is too late. The Catholic Church is not only the oldest existing institution, but it is also the most powerful, and its decision in the present international crisis is a vital one.

If this book, therefore, points out in great detail the

reactionary or Fascist trend in the Catholic Church rather than the counter movement toward Democracy, it should be taken not as an attack, or an indictment, but as a warning which is being shouted to the free peoples of the world by the facts themselves.

GEORGE SELDES.

Madrid, 1937.

Wilton, Conn., 1939.

PART I

FASCISM, DEMOCRACY, AND THE CHURCH

CHAPTER 1

Catholic Liaison With Fascism

THE Roman Catholic Church is fighting in many places for its very life, frequently with the help of Fascist and reactionary allies.¹

At certain times, in certain countries, the Church has opposed what we now call Fascism, has fought, given hostages, created martyrs; but increasingly, in the past two decades, expediency has driven the oldest and most powerful international into the strange and bloody arms of the Fascintern, and perhaps united their future. It is still not a union, but it is an obvious liaison, and still more obviously a crisis in the affairs of state and religion. Moreover, it is a crisis which may change the politics of the Vatican more than the outcome of the European War now being fought.

There are, of course, many Catholics who shudder at the word crisis, who are affronted by it, who deny there is or can be a Catholic crisis, who even deny there ever has been one—just as there are other Catholics who say that there is always a crisis in Catholicism, just as there is always one in every great and dynamic institution, and that the Church will come through it stronger than ever, just as it has from the great past crises. It has more communicants and more power today than at any time. It survived a crisis of 68 years

¹This statement is confirmed by a Catholic writer in the leading Catholic literary publication, *The Commonweal*, January 1, 1937. A great number of the statements in this book are from Catholic sources, and footnotes have been included for the benefit of those seeking complete documentation.

when there were two popes, one at Avignon, one at Rome, each uttering anathema and excommunication. In its days of weakness it survived the barbarian hordes which destroyed the Roman Empire, then slowly converted them; for three centuries it fought the Mohammedans with the cross and the sword; there was the crisis caused by the Arab and Moorish spread of culture in the Thirteenth Century; there was also a time (in 1527) when the Constable of Bourbon captured Rome, killed the pope's soldiers, imprisoned Clement VII in Castel San Angelo, and sacked Rome, a crisis in which Catholic blood flowed on both sides of the streets; there was the dispute of the Dominicans and the Jesuits on the question of the "Chinese Rites," the former accusing the latter of allowing the converts to practice idolatry, a dispute which nine Popes could not end and which was marked by the Jesuits' refusing to obey the Holy Father and imprisoning a papal legate; there was, of course, quite a crisis in the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church during the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, and there is the direct forerunner of our present political crisis, the French Revolution, from which emerged a new era of thinking, a new idea of democracy, a new conception of *Liberté, Égalité*, and perhaps eventually *Fraternité*, brought down to earth by social and economic and political means, whether the churches aid or hinder the movement.

It is difficult, of course, to define and name a crisis amid its own chaotic movements, its changes of tack, its compromises and secret dealings. Marxists call it the crisis of Socialism, the growth of a certain philosophy which the Church was the first to attack and is now, and more severely in the form of Communism, making its first and most desperate enemy. It is not so much the Marxian declaration that "religion is the soul of soulless conditions, the heart of a heartless world, the opium of the people," that troubles the

Roman Catholic Church, say the Marxists, as the success of the socialistic idea among the workingmen (and intellectuals) of the world. *Rerum Novarum*, a "revolutionary" encyclical in which Pope Leo XIII told the world that the laborer was worthy of his hire, and that he should in fact join labor unions, and *Quadragesimo Anno*, in which Pius XI, forty years later, took the side of labor against capitalism, also recognized the dread spectre which Marx and Engels said in 1848 was haunting Europe, and set out to lay it immediately, before it scared the life out of big business and organized religion.

The Catholic Church itself says the war is between Christianity (meaning Catholicism) and Communism, between the world of the spirit and the world of materialism.

Many Protestants, some Catholics, and all Liberals and Progressives deny this. The present crisis in world affairs is between democracy and Fascism. It is democracy which is in the most danger at present, not Christianity nor even Catholicism, and it is Fascism which is the menacing power in the whole world, not Communism.

On this question, as on most questions which will be discussed in this book, there is a divergence of opinion among Catholics themselves, one side (the majority) accepting the thesis of the majority of the hierarchy and press, the other joining minds with Liberals regardless of creed or propaganda. However, for liberal Catholics, there is a "dreadful dilemma" admits one of their leading spokesmen, George N. Shuster. Asked by Father Talbot in the Jesuit weekly, *America*, to choose between a dictatorship by Franco and that of Caballero, Mr. Shuster said that Franco was the greater of two evils, adding that "there is one reason why an identification of the Church with Fascism, however denominated, is so exceedingly dangerous. . . . Conservative people often fail to see what they are doing when they ignore the

evident perils of the Fascist state on the ground that it is after all preferable to Communism. . . . If the Fascist state wins out, the cleavages will be extraordinarily great, and (automatically) that antipathy to the Church will grow."

Another eminent Catholic layman, descendant of the Hohenstaufen kings, Prince Hubertus Loewenstein, also realizes the gravity of the Catholic crisis, especially the Spanish complications which have brought so much Catholic activity, much of it flagrant, into the open. Prince Loewenstein speaks² of the increase in distrust among working people for the temporal policy of the Church, and their wonder about the "comparative leniency toward the totalitarian states of the Right" as contrasted to "the relentless fight . . . against totalitarianism of the Left as realized in Soviet Russia."

Whereas in Germany Archbishop Faulhaber and the Bishops of Berlin and Münster have defied state despotism, on the other hand Cardinal Schulte of Cologne has endorsed Hitler, telegraphing War Minister von Blomberg, on the occasion of the destruction of the Locarno treaty, saying this deed was "an elevating example of sacrifice, ready patriotism, earnest discipline, and upright fear of God."

Moreover, the concordat which the papal nuncio prepared in July 1933 sacrificed the Catholic Centrum party and the Catholic trades and other workers' organizations "which had loyally served the cause of Christianity." "It is not surprising therefore," says the writer, "that devout Catholics are wondering whether active opposition of the Church forced upon her by Nazi totalitarianism would not, in spite of all authoritative condemnations, be withdrawn if the rights of the Church were no further infringed."

In Italy there is also a Catholic crisis. Fascist aggression has been supported by certain prelates, attacked by others.

²"Catholicism at the Crossroads," *Atlantic Monthly*, Sept. 1938.

This aggression is directly connected, the prince finds, to the "declining influence of the League of Nations, National Socialist rearmament, the breakdown of social security, the final encouragement which Japan needed for its invasion of China, the Rome-Berlin-Axis, involving its carefully prepared interference in Spanish affairs, and the rape of Austria. It was then that the rift in Catholic opinion became apparent. Only a fundamental revision of policy can heal this fundamental rift."

In America, Catholics have advertised the importance of the crisis in their own Church by making an issue of the Spanish War which has involved hundreds of thousands of persons, and rekindled many fires of intolerance and hatred which, with the decline of the Ku Klux Klan, had only smoldered for years. The Catholic press and priesthood were all for Franco and his Fascist allies. Few liberal Catholics and no member of the hierarchy dared openly denounce the Moors who murdered Christians on that long march from Badajoz to Madrid, or the Germans and Italians who murdered Christians in Guernica and Barcelona, and on all the roadsides of Spain where women and children and old men fled in long and tortured columns from the Fascist invaders. The average Catholic, denying there was a crisis in his Church, proved it triumphantly by saying that American Catholicism was 100 per cent for Franco, just as the Pope, the cardinals, the bishops and the Catholic press ordered it to be.

This statement is untrue.

Thanks to a scientific process of sampling public opinion in America, we are now able to prove conclusively that neither the American people nor the American Catholics have shaken hands with the Spanish leader in the world conspiracy against democracy and the progress of civilization. The Gallup Poll asked a sample portion of the American

people this question: "Which side do you sympathize with in the Spanish Civil War—the Loyalists or Franco?"

The replies showed that the American people were 76 per cent for the Loyalists, 24 per cent for Franco, and that between February 1937 and the end of December 1938, the Loyalists had gained 11 per cent, the Fascists lost a like number. That these figures and tendency resulted despite the tremendous pressure by the Catholic pro-Fascists against our press, radio and other means of public communication, is in itself a most interesting phenomenon.

But more interesting still is the Catholic division. Catholics voted:

Pro-Franco, 58 per cent.

Pro-Loyalist, 42 per cent.

Nor is this the whole story. No less than a third of all the Catholics asked refrained from voting. The Gallup Poll records this important minority declared itself not in sympathy with either side. Partisans of Spanish democracy, Roman Catholics, interpret the poll to include these 33 per cent on their side; they say those who refused to vote or called themselves impartial were using the "double refusal," an ancient device of saying neither yea nor nay when put on what is more modernly known as "the spot." But whether or not one accepts this claim, it is evident that by no juggling or propaganda can the followers of Franco in this country claim that more than 38.6 per cent of all the Catholics in the United States are actually *for* the Spanish Führer.

This fact refutes every claim in the Catholic press that the members of this Church were 100 per cent for Franco. For years the foregoing statement was repeated in almost every paper, in many pulpits, by the majority of the hierarchy, until it was accepted as truth even by Franco's enemies. Only a very few liberal Catholics maintained that this could not be, that the majority of American Catholics were anti-Fascist

and therefore anti-Franco, and that even if a poll should show a vast majority favoring the Spanish rebel, it would be the result of falsehoods, vicious propaganda, complete control by Franco's men of the means of communications, and therefore no symptom of reactionary bias among American Catholics. The Gallup Poll has cleared the air. It has proved that despite every fair and unfair means of propaganda and intimidation, the majority of American Catholics remain liberal, democratic, anti-Fascist and anti-Franco.

It shows, incidentally, that the crisis, which some would deny, not only exists, but is also acute.

The majority of Catholic papers took the Gallup Poll in good grace; some used it as a springboard for a more intensive propaganda campaign, for editorials castigating their followers. Others tried other methods. The Toledo *Catholic Chronicle*, for example, published a lot of atrocity pictures so horrible no secular publication would use them, blamed the outrages on the Loyalists—although there is evidence both of the faking of photographs admitted by Franco photographers and the use of Loyalist pictures of Fascist atrocities with changed captions—and deplored the fact that despite such evidence there are so few Roman Catholics who are for Franco. It also asked why the Gallup Poll should be taken at this time; it saw a sinister motive in this fact because there is also a "lift the embargo" movement on. The poll takers replied they began their work when Franco started for the Mediterranean, months earlier, and if it is true that the release was simultaneous with a pro-and-anti-embargo campaign, it is a feather of timeliness in their cap of veracity.

World Problems, on whose letterhead an office in the Vatican is listed, protested the Gallup Poll by saying that any Catholic who is anti-Franco is *ipso facto* no longer a Catholic, therefore he cannot vote as a Catholic, therefore the poll shows no Catholic votes against Franco. This publi-

cation, it seems, forgets that this vote does not concern faith and morals, and that therefore Catholics are free to participate, and that at least one cardinal is anti-Franco, and many priests and the majority of all the great Catholic intellectuals.

The Gallup Poll is one of the most heartening facts about Catholicism in America. If in this matter which so vitally affects the emotions and thoughts of all intelligent men and women, and despite every effort of the reactionaries to herd 20,000,000 Americans into a certain position, the majority still maintain the democratic traditions, then in all other matters, most of which will not have so deep a personal, religious and emotional appeal, the members of this Church have to be counted upon to fight against the reactionary forces in any intensified social and economic struggle.

With this optimistic assurance in the background, we can now examine the charge, frequently made and vehemently denied, that the Church—that is, the hierarchy, the Vatican, or the leadership as opposed to the congregations—has formed a liaison with Fascism.

In America, in recent days, leading Catholics themselves have begun to discuss the charge that Fascist trends are gaining. Mgr. James A. Magner, a frequent contributor to Catholic literary journals, writes, in *The Commonwealth* (under the title "The Church and Fascism"), that this charge is "most unpleasant." He summarizes seven reasons for its being made: (1) authoritarianism; (2) the attack on communism; (3) recognition of Franco; (4) friendly relations with Mussolini; (5) the Pope's continued appeal to the German concordat; (6) the Vatican's satisfaction with Corporate Portugal and Austria, and (7) diplomatic relations with dictators.

Another Catholic writer, J. J. Lyons, protesting in the lay press against anti-Catholicism, lists under eight headings the

common complaints upon which the pro-Fascist allegation is made :

- (1) The Church supported Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia.
- (2) The Church conspired to overthrow the Spanish Government and has supported Italian, Nazi and Moorish invasions of Spain.
- (3) Cardinal Innitzer and other influential Catholics such as Johan Bircher have aided Hitler in Austria and declared that National Socialism and Catholicism are not incompatible. (They ignore the Pope's recent attack on the swastika.)
- (4) Father Coughlin's Fascist activities in the United States.
- (5) Catholic Church in Canada aiding Minister Duplessis' semi-Fascism.
- (6) Catholic organizations' support of corrupt politicians like Mayor Hague.
- (7) Organizations like the International Catholic Truth Society attacking most liberal societies and progressive political figures as "red."
- (8) The Church's antagonism to labor unions.

Mgr. Magner and Mr. Lyons deny all fifteen charges; Mgr. Magner quotes Lord Acton's dictum that the Church is "the irreconcilable enemy of the despotism of the State"; he asks readers to distinguish between the Church and Vatican policies which he admits in practice are generally united in purpose; he defends the recognition of Franco, claiming this does not recognize the righteousness of his cause; and concludes that "it is true the Church has not explicitly named or condemned Fascism." Mr. Lyons says well-informed persons know that some influential Catholics are guilty of his eight charges, but "the vast majority of the 21,000,000 Catholics have been active in progressive democratic movements, are leaders in the C.I.O., have supported democracy every-

where, have even fought on the side of Loyalist Spain and are among the most ardent upholders of the liberal American traditions." Mr. Lyons suggests that "Catholics reveal their true democratic anti-Fascist views in the newspapers," to confound those who libel them.

A much more serious view of the Fascist charge is taken by the British Catholic writer William Teeling in *The Pope and Politics*. Parenthetically, it should be said that this book was reviewed favorably by Philip Burnham in *The Commonwealth* and in other liberal Catholic publications, but immediately after its appearance on the approved list of Cardinal Hayes's literature committee, Msgr. Arthur J. Scanlan protested that "it did appear on a tentative list sent to me and was not stricken out in one of the copies sent to the press"; in other words, this book, which draws sharp lines between progressive and reactionary elements and policies and favors the former, is not recommended in the New York diocese.

In his second edition, Mr. Teeling, who writes from intimate knowledge of the Vatican and mentions close relatives in the hierarchy, complains that the only adverse criticism of his book (dedicated "to those Catholics who have faith in the future of democracy") came from the Catholic press, and varied from vituperation to "the unfriendly examination of side-issues, thus avoiding the real argument of the book." Its purpose was to awaken Catholics the world over to the growing Catholic movement in resurgent democracies outside Europe which he says "provide a staunch bulwark against Communism on the one hand, and Fascism on the other," and to plead "that these democracies be allowed to become more articulate in shaping Vatican policy."

On the Italian question Teeling states bluntly that "the Vatican has thrown in its lot to a very considerable extent

with Mussolini, as every well-informed person in Europe knows"; of the aid given Italian Fascism by Cardinal Schuster and others during the Ethiopian war, his judgment is that "the injury to Catholicism of the Pope's attitude has been almost unbelievable. . . ." Of the participation on the side of the rebels in Spain, Teeling's judgment is that "once again the Vatican's diplomacy seems to have landed itself in a peculiarly difficult situation, and once more to have been manoeuvred into a position that labels it Fascist and prototalitarian." And, he concludes, "It is surely a tragedy that the teachings of Catholicism should seem to be combined with a background of a political national doctrine, which only a very small percentage of the Catholic world believe is in any sense a permanent political doctrine, namely Fascism."

Mr. Teeling admits that "there are moments one feels that the Vatican has gone entirely fascist," and great Catholic writers (including Mauriac, among others) deplore the fact that for millions of the Pope's devout followers "Christianity and fascism now mean the same thing." The liberal Catholic publications, few as they are, contain many more articles and letters on the subject of the Church and Fascism. As for non-Catholic opinion in liberal America, it is best expressed by the letter attacking the position of the Catholic hierarchy toward the Spanish War signed by a hundred and fifty Protestant educators, laymen and clergymen who accused the Spanish clergy of open hostility toward popular government, freedom of religion, separation of Church from state, and of being "the apologists for reaction and fascism." Incidentally, the failure of American Catholics to protest the stand of the Spanish hierarchy was emphasized by the Protestant leaders and resulted in a reply calling them "misinformed" and "hoodwinked." This naturally led to a number

of noted persons, including historians, international lawyers and others of the highest integrity, reasserting the non-Catholic viewpoint.

It is the view of the Methodist Federation for Social Service (which does not speak for the Methodist Episcopal Church, but for a group of more than 2,000 clergymen, laymen, eight bishops and many liberals, not one of whom is anti-Catholic) that the evidence is abundant that the Vatican is raising "a false battle cry against Communism" when it asks Protestants to join Catholics in a joint crusade, because, the Federation charges, it is in reality a campaign against democracy on a world-wide front. "The issue," says the Methodist survey bulletin, "is not religion and anti-religion. . . . The issue is not Fascism or Communism; it is Fascism or Democratic Government. The Pope put his attack on Communism in between those of Hitler and Mussolini. He became their ally. That means settlement of the Catholic educational question in Germany as it was adjusted in Italy. The Vatican is one of the international triumvirate lined up to destroy democratic government and restore autocracy. The statements of each make it clear that their purpose is to destroy democratically elected People's Governments, first in Spain, next in France; then to prevent them elsewhere. Hitler and Mussolini leave no doubt of this. The Pope says plainly that many of the elect have been deceived into political cooperation with Communists and this must be stopped. So when the democratic procedure leads to a coalition of all anti-reactionary forces to protect democratic government against Fascism, democracy must be destroyed. Anti-Communism is the smokescreen for this attack.

"To destroy democracy is now the historic necessity of all reaction—religious, political, economic. Otherwise it will be swept aside by the rising tide of progress. When this issue becomes clear, as it is in Spain and the international lineup

that Spain has brought about, how will the religious forces line up? The Vatican can neither deceive nor hold all its forces in Spain. Prominent Catholic theologians there are attacking the hierarchy for its assault on a democratically elected people's government. Simple priests of the poor are bitterly denouncing it, as John Bull did long ago in England. The Basque priests are with the government almost to a man, and are shot by the Fascists when caught."

Defending the severe statements of the bulletin, Dr. Harry F. Ward of Union Theological Seminary declared that the political policies of the Vatican, not the Catholic Church, were under attack. "It is the business of the Jesuit clique that now dominates the Vatican," he said, "to cover their political objectives with religious slogans, so that the Archbishop of Westminster can say, 'When Fascism goes down, God's cause goes down': and General O'Duffy can take his Blue Shirts from Ireland to Spain on a 'crusade for Catholic Faith.'"

The Anglican *Church Times* (London) finds "reason to fear a world alliance between Fascism and the Roman Church"; Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes says "this sharp lining up of the Catholic Church against Communism puts it by implication as an ally of Fascism," an implication which many Catholics will resent, but, "it is more than mere implication for the Church has lined up very specifically in the present Spanish struggle, where the opponents of the existing Spanish government are obviously and openly of Fascist persuasion"; and Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, also asserting that the Church is joined to Fascist politics, says liberal Catholics "do not deny that their choice of Fascism is a hard alternative. They justify it by the assertion that Fascism does not intend to destroy the Church while Communism does. One might answer that Fascism intends to destroy Christianity"; and to give one more notable example, Lewis Mumford,

calling upon the Church to give up "its suicidal policy of upholding Fascism," says that the American Catholics are democratic, but "the Catholic priesthood even took over the typical Fascist hoax of making war on popular government by playing up the fictitious threat of Communism and by branding liberal reform as an active contribution to Bolshevism." "Popular charlatans within the Church, like the lie-quoting Father Coughlin," continues Mumford, "have by word of mouth and in print allied themselves to those reactionary forces in Europe which are bent on the extirpation of democracy. . . . It is not communism that menaces the peace of the Church in democratic America: It is its own strange outbursts of hysterical intolerance. . . . The Church has been threatened by nothing in America except its own folly. By actively siding with the Fascists it has been arming its enemies and putting into the opposite camp those who, by their very love for democracy and liberty, are its best protectors."

It is this attempt to make of the Spanish War a holy crusade for Christianity that has so disillusioned the liberal Protestant press, alienated many friends of the Catholic Church, caused doubts among the tolerant, and according to a statement made to this writer by Dr. John Haynes Holmes, caused such a revival of anti-Catholic feeling in certain quarters that its menace has outstripped the menace of anti-Semitism. The organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the *Christian Advocate*, suggested editorially that in trying to make a crusade out of Franco's rebellion and another crusade out of the fight against Communism in America, the Catholic Church was in danger of playing into the hands of Fascism which, said the *Advocate*, was also anti-God.

Another serious warning was given by the commission of international justice and good will of the Brooklyn Church

and Mission Federation which said, in a resolution, that "a religious anti-Red drive is charged with danger to domestic peace and tolerance. The spirit of persecution once aroused in our schools and legislatures could be easily turned by demagogues into Klanism, from which the church would be one of the first sufferers."

How true this warning is has been proven by a Spanish delegation which toured the Southern states. It made its appeal to Cuban, Porto Rican and Mexican workingmen in the cigar factories, in the mills, and on the Southern fields. These workingmen made sacrifices when they gave dimes and quarters to the cause of the Spanish workingmen. But there was another motivation back of the unexpected flood of checks of hundreds of dollars from wealthy native-born who, upon investigation, said they knew very little about the right and wrong of the war in Spain, but were sick and tired of the Catholic propaganda against the Loyalists and felt instinctively that they were on the other side of Fathers Coughlin and Curran, Cardinal Hayes and the Pope. It was a modified form of Klanism speaking. It shows the possibility of the reawakening of one of the most violent, vicious and intolerant movements in the history of the country.

I will return to the Klan in a later chapter. The most obvious sign of Fascism and pro-Fascist tendencies in the world today is anti-Semitism. Before examining the evidence on the alleged Catholic liaison with Fascism, let us inquire into the subject of Catholics and anti-Semitism.

CHAPTER 2

Catholics and Anti-Semitism

THE most important facts about American Catholics and anti-Semitism are these:

That there is no greater percentage of anti-Semitism among Catholics than there is among other sects;

That anti-Semitism is openly recognized by Catholic leaders, denounced by those who represent the liberal wing, approved by those who speak for the reactionaries. To say that the latter, some of them priests and editors, are neither Christians nor Catholics is merely to extend the dictum of Pope Pius XI who declared it was impossible for anyone professing to follow Jesus Christ to be an anti-Semite. In Royal Oak, Michigan, and in the diocese of Brooklyn, however, there are many Catholics who did not approve the Pope's views.

There are numerous proofs of Catholic anti-Semitism. There is, for example, a secret poll made by an important nonpartisan organization whose name I am not at liberty to state at present, which, while showing the extent of the spread of race hatred, did allay the suspicion—based mostly on Father Coughlin's radio speeches and the stuff in the *Brooklyn Tablet*—that there was more anti-Semitism among Catholics than persons of other cults. Then there is the American Institute of Public Opinion poll on Nazi barbarism which shows that almost 8,000,000 persons in democratic, humanitarian America approve Hitler's anti-Semitic policy,

which is murder and robbery. This poll further showed that the largest percentage which applauds German brutality is to be found in New England, at the time of European persecution the haven for Protestants, Quakers, Catholics and all nonconformists. Finally, this poll shows that there are 7 per cent of American Catholics who approve the pogroms, bloodshed, and despoliation of the Jews in Germany but disapprove Hitler's equally vicious but less bloody campaign against the Catholics.

So much for statistics. In the Catholic press there is the admission that anti-Semitism exists. Thus, *The Commonwealth* states "That anti-Jewish feeling is rife in the United States is, perhaps, not surprising; that it should be growing here and there among Catholics is less understandable." And that statement, incidentally, shed a cruel light upon the first poll mentioned, because there is little doubt that had one been taken years ago, at a time when the Ku Klux Klan was still powerful, and Catholics as well as Jews the victims, it would have shown very little Catholic anti-Semitism, whereas today that brand is equal in percentage to the general anti-Semitism.

"I note with alarm," wrote Father Laurence Kent Patterson, S.J., to the Jesuit weekly *America*, to which he was a frequent and gifted contributor, "the growth of crude anti-semitic feeling in certain Catholic quarters. Even a section of our press is tainted by it.

"We Catholics need a constructive program to meet the common front. It consists in applying Papal principles to concrete problems. Rabid nationalism, anti-Semitism, throttling tariffs have no place in Catholic Action.

"I add this: a careful check-up shows that the leading men in Soviet Russia today are not predominantly Jewish. The Stalin regime is really nationalistic, using the common front as an agent of its foreign policy.

"Hitler smashed the Jews first, but the turn of Catholics and Protestants soon came. Goebbels and his ilk are not preferable even to Stalin and his followers. . . ."

An extremely interesting reaction followed. There were several priests and laymen who approved Father Patterson, but there were others who preferred anti-Semitism. In *America* (November 12), of three writers the first was opposed to anti-Semitism, but the second, who signed himself "Arbogastus," said one must make distinctions between the doctrines which do not and those which do identify Jehovah with the one, true and triune God. . . . "If, however," continues the writer, "by anti-semitism we mean opposition to the Jewish efforts to permeate the world with materialism and to pervert our Christian faith, then every Christian must be an anti-Semite."

To prove his point he asks philo-semites to study the historical attitude of the Church which he says "will not contradict herself."

The third writer, Paul B. Ward, C.S.P., approving the plea for fairness, points out to the editor of *America* that in the very issue in which Father Patterson denounced anti-Semitism by Catholics, this Catholic organ published an editorial saying:

"Most of the 3,200 Americans (in the Abraham Lincoln Battalion which fought in Spain) were Jewish and foreign-born riff-raff Americans; a small percentage were respectable citizens. The most of them were enlisted, shipped and smuggled into Communist Spain by American and French Communists." It also calls them "reckless, fanatical Communist soldiers."

America is one of the many Catholic publications that indulges in baiting the Jews because of the libel that associates the race with Communism. "This review," it said (November 5, 1938), "on occasions has urged the American

Jews to declare themselves as openly opposed to Communism and thus to refute a charge that seemed to be well founded and that was all too well believed." Commenting on the statement of Judge Milton M. Wecht that Communism is the antithesis of Judaism and that Judaism is opposed to Communist ideas, *America* said (May 7, 1938), "These are encouraging words, but are they the sentiments of the majority? . . . If more Jewish spokesmen reiterated opposition to Communism and fewer Jewish people joined the Communist ranks, the American people would, on this point, have a kindlier feeling toward the Jew."

America permits one letter writer ("G. R. A.," June 25, 1938) to say that while the world is disgusted and alarmed by Franco's bombardment of civilians, there is no protest against the 40,000 murdered in Madrid (*sic*). "How could the Marxists who control France and the Jews controlling England and this country, show horror toward the murders of priests, nuns and Catholics." This is, of course, the repetition of the Nazi lie of Jewish control. Another writer says (July 30, 1938) that the Spanish War is a struggle "between Christocracy and Judeocracy. In this country it is evident that Catholic editors have the jitters when it comes to the Jewish question. Now your statement that the Spanish war is not a 'holy war' nor a 'religious crusade' makes my Catholic blood boil. It upsets my stomach. Is Maritain your prophet? Are you blind or pusillanimous for fear of the Jews?" Writers in *Der Stuermer* are no more vicious in their anti-Semitism. *America* knows that there is no Jewish pope, no Jewish hierarchy or organization in America, that there are rich Jews and poor Jews, good Jews and bad Jews, and that they have no spokesmen and can have none because they are divided into classes, factions, groups, and by social, economic and political lines; that workingmen among them may be Liberals or Socialists or Communists, and million-

aires among them, Republicans and Liberty Leaguers and even Fascists. In fact, many of them are Fascists. Many of the rich and powerful supported Hitler until the other day, and Mussolini was their pet. Giuseppe Toeplitz, head of the Banca Commerciale, was the financial agent of Fascismo. He was a Polish-born Jew. Nevertheless, *America*, leading Jesuit publication, continues to print matter attacking the Jews as a class, church or unit.

The monthly magazine *The Sign* is not so frequent a user of anti-Semitic argument as *America*, but its attitude can be learned from the following 1938 editorial excerpts. In April it said:

Persecutions of Jews is one of the blackest pages in modern history. It is particularly shameful to note that some who have been most active in anti-semitic activities are Christians, at least in name, followers of One Who inculcated love of one's neighbor without distinction as to race or color as an essential condition of discipleship.

Now, persecution is never right but it must be admitted that the Jews have at times offered some grounds for the assaults which have been made on them. Since the outbreak of hostilities in Spain, the Jews of the world have shown a united front against Franco and Nationalist Spain and in favor of the Madrid-Valencia-Barcelona regime. They have used all the resources at their command through propaganda and material assistance to aid the cause of the Reds and to harm that of the Nationalists.

This is one of the typical "no anti-Semitism but . . ." editorials which one finds in many reactionary Catholic publications. Most of them are based on the charge that most Jews are against Franco. The fact that free men, honest men, cultured men and all men of good will, regardless of religious or political affiliation, were almost 100 per cent against

Franco might also be considered by these publications, but never is. In July, *The Sign* wrote:

Here in America at the present time there are evidences of an increasing anti-Semitism. It is to be regretted and should be opposed by Christians and Jews alike. To the Jews it belongs, however, to remove some of the causes which have aroused a feeling of ill will toward them. One of these—at least as far as Catholics are concerned—is their open advocacy and support of the Reds in Spain. . . .

Jews are by no means all Communists, but a disproportionate number of that race are either Communists or members of other radical groups which are openly and violently hostile to Christianity. Fired by a hatred of Nazism, Jews fight fiercely against Fascism in all its forms. Jewish-owned publications and publications whose policies are, to some extent, determined by their large Jewish advertisers, have been beating the drums so loud and long against a supposed Fascist menace that it is becoming nauseating. The net result will probably be to cause persecution of Jews in Spain and Italy, where they have been very well treated. . . .

Remove some of its causes and it will be much easier for us to work together for the removal of anti-Semitism.

The foregoing statements say plainly that it is wrong for anyone to fight Fascism. It falsely charges Jewish publications with catering to their advertisers by making their policy anti-Fascist. It may be true that many Jewish publications fight Hitler's Nazism, but would this Catholic publication have them, or anyone, fight for Hitler and the Nazi ideology? *The Sign's* editorial cannot be interpreted except as an approval of the Fascist ideology—which is open antidemocracy, anti-Liberal, and opportunistically, anti-Catholic.

In September, *The Sign* has an apology for the artificial anti-Semitism which Mussolini ordered created to please Hitler. It quotes "an authoritative Italian spokesman" to the

effect that "The Jews have in every country of the world with their men and their means, formed the general staff of anti-Fascism." This is of course a lie. Jews with means, as previously stated, financed Fascism. But *The Sign* says, "This is a charge which cannot be ignored. The Jews have raised such a howl of protest against 'Fascist' nations that it is not surprising that Italy is taking concrete steps to meet the situation. . . ." Finally, in December, *The Sign* explains that ". . . the term 'anti-Semite' is equivocal—it can mean several things. If, for example, Jews really held, as some claim, that their *nation* is to be the Messiah, to which all other peoples must be subject, Christians could and should oppose this effrontery. This would be 'anti-Semitism' in a favorable sense."

The most virulent anti-Semitic publication in America edited by responsible Catholics is Coughlin's *Social Justice*. Another reactionary Jew-baiting sheet is the *Brooklyn Tablet*. But many Catholic publications throughout the world engage in anti-Semitism. In Paris the publishing houses which produce the Catholic books also produce the anti-Semitic books. Take for example the publisher of *Jesus Christ: Son Message*, the firm of Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, 117 rue de Rennes. This firm will also supply you with anti-Jewish and anti-Masonic "literature," for example, *S.D.N. (League of Nations) Super-Etat Maconnique*; *La Mystérieuse Internationale Juive (La dictature des puissances occult)*, *La Guerre Occult (Juifs et Francs-Maçons à la Conquete du Monde)*. The bookshop operated by this firm sells Bibles, missals, catechisms, and forgeries intended to create hatred and anti-Semitism. It is not unique in Paris.

In London, *The Catholic Times* carries on the same unchristian practices. For example, in its issue of May 7, 1937, the feature article, "The Dominance of the Jew in Russia. They hold virtual monopoly of high state and industrial

posts," begins by deploring the vile attitudes of certain Poles and Germans toward the Jews. It is "incredible," it is "the despair of civilization." But, "the problem is here, however, and in discussing Russia it must be faced." *The Catholic Times* then alleges that "the Gentile population of Russia is slowly but undoubtedly becoming anti-Semitic," which judgment is based merely on the new constitution affirming equality and denouncing prejudice. It adds that "the Jews certainly have the best of the argument in Soviet Russia. Most of the best positions, not only in high offices of state but in factories, and hotels, are held by the Chosen People." It goes on to say that Lenin was a Jew, which is an absolute lie: Immediately afterward, *The Catholic Times* declares that "if Lenin was not a Jew" he "was brought up by Jews, married a Jewess," etc. This is also untruth. Then follows the statement that "The Soviet Government has been and still is largely composed of Jews," which is another falsification, as reputable Catholics have proved.

The Catholic Times is a more dignified, more literate, and more intelligent publication than the *Brooklyn Tablet* and other anti-Semitic weeklies, but when it comes to Russia, it goes the whole hog. It even reprints the most atrocious statements by Goebbels under a line saying they are "probably not true," just as Coughlin reprints forgeries after admitting they are probably just forgeries.

On its editorial page, *The Catholic Times* speaks of strange propaganda against the angelic General Franco, dismisses the massacre at Badajoz, denies the murders at Guernica, and over all its own propaganda and distortions, it publishes "The Holy Father's Blessing": ". . . the Sovereign Pontiff blesses the paper and imparts his paternal Apostolic Benediction to its Proprietor, to its Editor and to its staff." This is even more shocking than mere testimonials from cardinals which the most prejudiced and bigoted of Catholic weeklies

in America print on their mastheads.

Another British publication, *The Month*, which also supports Franco as defender of "the Faith and civilization," says the war in Spain was a struggle "of truth against falsehood, of love against hatred, of angels against 'the spirits of wickedness in high places' . . ." It concludes: "We cannot hope that the triumph of the Nationalists will cause any cessation in the world-wide press-polemic directed against them by an unholy alliance of Jews, Freemasons and atheists . . ." (May, 1938). In June 1938, *The Month* admitted that the *Protocols* are "egregious forgeries," exposed time and again by "competent historians" and notably by Pere Pierre Charles, S.J., of Louvain, and in its own columns in 1921. It continues:

. . . anti-Semitism, in its methods at least, is closely related to anti-Catholicism, and both should be repudiated by all honest men. This need not prevent us from denouncing Jews, who, whether as communists or atheists or merely materialists, are openly or covertly attacking the Church in various lands, although there is no real distinction between an anti-religious Jew and an anti-religious Gentile. Jews, for instance, seem to have been prominent in poisoning the press in the United States against the Spanish Nationalists, and many are members of Continental freemasonry, essentially hostile to Catholicism. . . .

There are few openly Catholic anti-Semitic organizations in America. Among the 800 societies, federations, and bunds, which Dr. Alvin Johnson of the New School for Social Research lists, there is only one calling itself Catholic, but on the other hand there is sufficient evidence of anti-Semitism among the ordinary Catholic social, fraternal and affiliated organizations. But all these groups are not a fraction as vicious as Father Coughlin.

This Fascist demagogue is worth a chapter by himself. But

one example of his use of falsification in his anti-Semitic campaign must be given here. The evidence comes from Monsignor John A. Ryan, leading spokesman of liberal Catholics, professor of Moral Theology and Industrial Ethics at Catholic University, and director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Coughlin has used as evidence against the Jews a book called *The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., professor in Blackrock College, Dublin. The fact that such Catholic professors who write such trash and cause such racial hatred can publish books with the *nihil obstat* of their bishops and continue to teach in Catholic universities is just another proof of the perennial charge that the Jesuits are the minority group in the Catholic Church which have kept anti-Semitism a live issue. This Father Fahey (on page 90) publishes a list of 25 names allegedly prominent in the first Soviet Government. In the evil-intentioned hands of Father Coughlin this list becomes the "quasi-cabinet members" of the Lenin government of 1917. But where did this professor of a university and author of a book called *The Mystical Body of Christ* get this sensational documentation? He got it from a cheap vicious little sheet of no reputation called *The Patriot*, which is not only anti-Semitic but the equal of *Der Stuermer*, the Nazi organ of falsification, eroticism, and anti-Semitism. Father Fahey takes not only one but four extracts from *The Patriot* and Monsignor Ryan goes so far as to say that Fahey is anti-Semitic and biased.

In his appendix, Father Fahey also gives four pages from the *Protocols of Zion*; he admits they have not been established as authentic, but makes the egregious statement that they have not been proved forgeries. Well, they have been, and none but professional Nazis or those having Nazi minds challenge the proof.

Fahey bases his charge that the Jews dominated the Soviet regime in 1917 on an item in a weekly of no standing whatever. This weekly in turn says it got its facts from the *Documentation Catholique* of March 6, 1920. Monsignor Ryan points out that this institution is not part of the Church. It is not. But it is another of these Catholic anti-Semitic institutions which flourish in Paris. Monsignor Ryan's investigation discloses that *Documentation Catholique* says it got its story from an alleged report made to the French High Commissioner by the American Secret Service, that *Documentation Catholique* claims that "the American Secret Service takes responsibility" for the authenticity of this list of 25.

But does it? Further investigation reveals that Chief Wilson of the United States Secret Service stated on November 28, 1938, when this Coughlin scandal first appeared, that "after an exhaustive search of the records and consultation" of members on duty from 1916 to 1920:

"It is certain that no such report was ever made by the United States Secret Service."

Monsignor Ryan adds that the phraseology of the statement which the various anti-Semitic organizations and orators quote "suggests that it is anti-Semitic propaganda rather than the report of an agency of the United States Government."

Furthermore, Monsignor Ryan points out that Coughlin does not even quote correctly this anti-Semitic hoax, because Father Fahey never uses the words "quasi-cabinet" for the list of names, but merely calls them individuals who made themselves "remarkable" in "certain Soviet organizations which came into power in Russia in October 1917."

On November 27, 1938, a week after Father Coughlin was accused of using falsifications as evidence, he bolstered his case by saying that the Fahey-*Documentation Catholique*-

Secret Service nonsense had been "incorporated in the British White Paper." The next day the British Library of Information in New York denied this story. And so it goes, one falsification after another, a Catholic priest the propagator of them all, and another Catholic priest exposing them.

No one has been caught so flagrantly using falsification, employing forgeries, indulging in plagiarism, and generally engaging in unchristian (to say the least) methods in furthering the campaign of hate against the Jews as that man in clerical garb, Father Coughlin, but he does not stand alone. Other notable Catholics have given their voices and pens to that cause.

Valentine De Balla, professor of political science at St. Peter's College, speaking to the members of the Holy Name Society of St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church, accused the press of New York City of being "controlled by certain groups, who, for selfish reasons do not tell the truth about Russia," adding that the "special group owning or controlling the press in America sympathizes with Communism in order to crush Hitlerism."

I believe that this statement can be called a falsehood. The press of America may not tell the truth about Russia, but it errs from the other side: it usually tells all which is harmful to Russia and very little in favor, and as for sympathizing with Communism in order to crush Hitlerism, that of course is a plain lie. The American press does not sympathize with Communism. Not one newspaper in America sympathizes with Communism. (Of course the Communist press, which consists of three dailies, is Communist, but it does not enter into either Professor De Balla's or this discussion.)

This teacher of political science, asked to name the "special group," replied: "The Jews." But the truth is—there are only a handful of Jewish publishers in America, their circulation is a tiny minority, they control no great chains such as

Hearst's, and without exception they are either neutral or anti-Communitic, chiefly the latter. The *New York Times*, under Adolph Ochs, conducted a three-year campaign of Red baiting against Soviet Russia. The liberal pro-New Deal publisher, J. David Stern, engaged in a campaign of Red baiting in 1938 which cost the *New York Post* all its most left circulation. The Annenberg *Philadelphia Inquirer* is a staunch Republican organ. There is, in fact, no pro-Jewish press, even if there are a handful of Jewish publishers in America. The Jews who own big newspapers have to own millions of dollars—or at least control them—and that means that their interests are the same as those of other millionaires—Catholic and Protestant, who own and control the rest of the press; in other words, they are conservative, or reactionary, and perhaps even Fascist. It is nonsense to make the charges which De Balla makes, and if he really has any respect for academic traditions and the eternal search for scientific truth, to which colleges are supposed to be dedicated, he ought to declare openly the falsehood of his accusations.

More subtle, but none the less dubious, is the anti-Semitism of the leading Catholic writer, Hilaire Belloc, who dedicates his book *The Jews* to his secretary, Miss Ruby Goldsmith, "the best and most intimate of my Jewish friends." Some of Mr. Belloc's best friends are Jews. And some of the world's oldest hypocrisies also. He argues in this wise:

"The Bolshevik movement was a Jewish movement, but not a movement of the Jewish race as a whole. Most Jews were quite extraneous to it; very many indeed, and those of the most typical, abhor it; many actively combat it. The imputation of its evils to the Jews as a whole, is a grave injustice and proceeds from a confusion of thought whereof I, at any rate, am free. . . .

"Jews as such are not Communists, but the modern Communist movement was inspired and is directed by Jews. That is why the term 'Jewish Communism' is heard everywhere in conversation, though not in the Press; the Revolution now advancing in Europe is a part of the Jewish problem.

"The nature of the conflict in Spain and how and why it is a branch of that general revolutionary movement called Jewish Communism must first be appreciated.

"Moscow is in power at Valencia, at Barcelona. . . ."

Mr. Belloc is clever. He appears as the Jews' advocate in the Russian case, after cleverly repeating his own charges, which differ from that of ordinary Jew baiters, and then proceeds to make all the usual slanderous charges against the Jews in the Spanish case.

Throughout his writings Mr. Belloc says he is not a Jew baiter. But he loves to refer to Karl Marx merely as "Mordecai himself." This may be Chestertonian wit. Mr. Belloc speaks of "the progress of the Revolution at work throughout our culture and inspired by Jewish Communism"; he also speaks of the active opposition to Jewish power, the "counter-offensive," as they call it, which has been launched in Berlin. This is, of course, an acceptance of the Nazi nonsense. "The Spanish conflict is essentially a religious war," he continues, adding that "the superficial observer" may think it "the struggle between Capital and Labour." Not only the superficial observer, but also 12,000,000 or more Spaniards, many of whom lost their lives, did not consider it a religious war, but a war between capital and labor—themselves being labor, and Franco, Hitler and Mussolini representing capital.

Mr. Belloc, previously known as a historian—although a highly prejudiced one—states that the Loyalists received aid from abroad, adding that "Franco and his Insurgents were also receiving reinforcements; not of course on the same scale

as their opponents." Would Mr. Belloc be willing to make a correction, to write the foregoing paragraph in the very reverse way, or does he prefer to go down in history as a historian who did not tell the truth? He places the number which came to Franco's aid as "more than 8000 men and less than 10,000, so far as ground work was concerned . . . on the revolutionary side—[meaning, of course, the anti-rebel side; this is just another touch of that old Chestertonian wit]—far larger number of hired mercenaries . . . came flooding into Eastern Spain." The Republic hired a few dozen aviators; the majority of them were dismissed for drunkenness and cowardice; a few stayed on heroically, but otherwise the Republic had no hired men, although it did have some 20,000 (or less) volunteers from twenty (or more) countries. The Insurgents had drafted Moors, and Italians forced to fight by Mussolini, many of them jobless men who admitted by the hundred they came for the 10-lire payment per day. But Mr. Belloc is again straying from the truth.

Belloc always speaks of the Jews as an integrated force, whereas every intelligent person knows that there is no Jewish unity, no Jewish pope, no Jewish hierarchy, no Jewish agreement on any subject, but on the other hand dissension and class struggle, and a great hatred between the upper class and the poor, just as there is among Christians and others. For Belloc to attack the Jews he must have the Jews one nation, and since there is no Jewish nation, this maker of salable paradoxes calls it an "invisible" nation, but nevertheless a state of government to which a Jew owes an allegiance superior to that of the state in which he lives.

This of course is curious reasoning coming from a Catholic leader. The Catholics have a Pope and a hierarchy, and history records Catholics publicly proclaiming the Pope to be superior to kings and nations, and our own time records the

views of some Catholics who say their allegiance to the Pope is first, their allegiance to their temporal ruler second. This is the charge always made by Ku Kluxers and other Catholic baiters against the Catholics in America, and it is the charge which Al Smith denied when he ran for President. Most Americans accept the Catholic statement that their temporal allegiance is to the President, their religious allegiance only to the Pope. But the Jews have no similar organization, no allegiances abroad, no Elders, not even the semblance of outside control. Yet it is a good stick to beat them with. So Mr. Belloc invents an invisible state to which the Jews owe their first allegiance, a state which exists, of course, only in Mr. Belloc's strange mind.

His method is to explain the Jews to the Gentiles, the Gentiles to the Jews, as if he were writing a defense of the latter, but nothing he has written in his lifetime is so insulting, libelous, distorted, unfair and therefore unjust. He creates a false premise, then devotes his book to expounding it. Pretending to give his Jewish friends friendly advice, he actually gives munition to all fellow anti-Semites for their attacks.

He ridicules the *Protocols* as forgeries. He shows they bear internal evidence of fraud. Then he proceeds to make a new series of *suggestio falsi*. For example, he says that the Jews, or rather some wealthy Jews, dictated those parts of the Versailles treaties dealing with their coreligionists; he intimates that bribery was a force in the treaty making, and that those who were bribed were the men who made the treaties, namely, Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George. Belloc repeats the oldest of all the falsehoods, denounced by the popes once, that "there is already something like a Jewish monopoly in high finance." He makes out a list of monopolies where there is "a growing tendency" of Jewish ownership.

Belloc states that in the World War the British nation realized "the complete control exercised over things absolutely necessary to the nation's survival by half a dozen Jews, who were completely indifferent as to whether we or the enemy should emerge alive from the struggle." If Mr. Belloc had stated that the merchants of death, Catholic, Jew and Protestant, were of this opinion, both in England, in Germany, and in France, it might have some validity. But although he cannot see such forces behind the scenes in world affairs, he also is smart enough, for the purpose of making out a case regardless of all the facts, of suppressing one that is important, namely, that Chaim Weizmann did more to save the Allies than any one man: he found a new way of making munitions. On the other hand, another Jewish patriot, Fritz Haber, probably did more to help keep the Fatherland going in the World War than any other individual. It so happens—there is no racial, religious, or any other reason for it—that the majority if not all the merchants of death were not Jews, and that among the men who were most patriotic and whose contributions were unequalled, there were several Jews. Mr. Belloc's case against the Jews would break down if he told the truth. So he skips it.

There are other noted Catholic writers who join with their press, priests and laymen in expressing anti-Semitic feelings. The Duchess de Nemours (formerly Marguerite Watson of Newport) was "profoundly shocked" over President Roosevelt's protest against the massacres of Jews in Germany and so cabled; the Newman Clubs of New York Province held a meeting on "The Historic and Contemporary Causes of Anti-Semitism" to which they invited Robert Edward Edmundson, one of the leading anti-Semitic crackpots of America, to make an address; a Brooklyn parish priest told his congregation that no good Catholic should work for Jews

as all Jews were Communists, and read out the names of girls of the parish whom he urged to quit their employ,¹ and there are scores of similar instances.

But they are hardly worth mentioning compared to the bloody history of anti-Semitism in continental Europe. Almost half the population of Europe is Roman Catholic, and for centuries it was ruled by kings and tyrants who styled themselves "apostolic majesties" and knelt before the Popes. And, although it is true that many Popes declared themselves against anti-Semitism, and at times deplored massacres of Jews, it is also a fact that even today vicious and murderous anti-Semitism still flourishes in nations which are not only Catholic but which also listen to the Popes.

Spain and Portugal were the most Catholic of nations at one time and the most murderous in their treatment of non-Catholics. But that is past history, and should not be part of any present-day indictment. But within the past two years two Popes have blessed Franco and his Fascist system and neither has mentioned the new anti-Semitism in Spain.

In his victory speech in Burgos, February 28, 1939, Franco uttered publicly his first threat against the Jews. After pledging co-operation with Portugal, Italy and Germany, he said that "while music is heard and our flag is raised there are wandering throughout the world the damned, such as the eternal Jew, whom nobody wants because they are a Communist horde." Franco's minister, Suñer, has publicly attacked Judaism as an enemy and Franco's subordinate, General Lopez Pinto, military commander of Burgos, said in 1938 that "this is a war of religion. The enemies of Christ are the Jews and Freemasons. He who is not with Christ is against Him. He who is not with us is against us. War without mercy on all Jews and Freemasons! They must perish,

¹ Letter to *The Nation*, June 5, 1937.

one and all." These military outbursts were in harmony with the Francoist *Mein Kampf*² which declares that "the program for the total Catholicization of Spain cannot be achieved without decided and opportune action against the anti-Catholic sects; against Masonry and Judaism. . . . Masonry and Judaism are the two great and powerful enemies of the Fascist movement in the regeneration (sic) of Europe. . . . Hitler is thoroughly right in his anti-Jewish fight."

Translated into action, these words of Franco, Pinto, Suñer and Pemartin mean murder and robbery. Jews have been victims of Franco Fascism from the first days of the Civil War. The Asociación Hispano Hebrea has published the lists of hundreds of Spanish Jews killed and plundered—Moises Banhamu, banker, Ceuta, murdered and family forced to pay 30,000 pesetas; Fortunato Bendeham, secretary of the Jewish community of Ceuta, shot for being a Jew and Freemason; Abraham Sarfaty, French Jew, shot at Tetuan; Esther Serrula, Jewish girl, shot at Tetuan; Dr. Pariente, shot at Larache; Mordejay Hasson and Leon Hasson, Greek-Jewish businessmen, shot at Saragossa. In Saragossa, Spain, eighty persons were executed for being Jews. In Spanish Morocco the number of victims is probably greater. At Tetuan the Francoists dragged pigs into the synagogues and the Falangistas fined the Jewish community 100,000 pesetas. On July 1, 1937, and again in August and September, Falangistas led mobs of Moors in pogroms in which many Jews were beaten, many women and children wounded. Several died later.

The Catholic press of Franco Spain is almost entirely anti-Semitic. It approves of Hitler and Mussolini in their treatment of the Jewish minority and publishes all the usual lies and forgeries, including the *Protocols*. *Voz de Espana* (December 9, 1938) said of the Lima Conference that it was

² *Que es Lo Nuevo* by Jose Pemartin, Minister of Education, pp. 408-9.

"organized by Jews and atheists so that the United States could enslave the American hemisphere." The Spanish edition of the "Letter of the Spanish Bishops" on the Spanish War, published by Rafye of Burgos in *El Mondo Catolico y la Carta Colectiva del Episcopado Espanol*, is described as glorifying the war as a "fight of Christians and western civilization against the pretended civilization of Asiatic, masonic and Jewish atheism."

In Poland the Roman Catholics are 75 per cent of the population, but the Poles ruled large minorities consisting largely of Ukrainians and Jews. Both these people suffered persecution until the war of 1939 broke out. No sooner was Poland established by the League of Nations than massacres of the Ukrainians, who are Greek Catholic by religion, and Jews took place. In 1919 when Clemenceau was given the report, "Les atrocities polonaises en Galicie Ukrainienne," he refused to publish it, and in the following year the American press, including papers owned by Jews, refused to publish the findings of a British investigation commission on pogroms against the Polish Jews. Since then the Polish government had been attempting by legal and illegal means to drive the Jews out or deprive them of the means of making a living, but the Vatican took no step to curb a Catholic nation. An excuse is offered in the fact the persecution was nationalistic, not religious.

In Catholic Hungary the same program of starving a people to death is being carried on without protest from the primate, the hierarchy, the Vatican or the Pope. "Drastic anti-Jewish laws which may cut off an estimated 300,000 Jews from their means of livelihood" were reported by the Associated Press, May 3, 1938, and the expropriation of all Jewish-owned land "to provide an initial 500,000 acres for Hungary's landless peasants." Hungary is a feudal country owned by less than sixty families, and its problem is agrarian.

The few rich landlords rule the nation. If the regent Horthy were a humanitarian, he could provide for the landless by dividing the estates of his Fascist friends and chief supporters, but since this is out of the question, the government proposes taking 10 per cent of the Aryan estates and 100 per cent of the Jewish estates, expropriating not only the few rich Jews, but also the thousands of Jews who barely live on the soil.

In Czechoslovakia there were two Catholic parties: the Czech Catholics liberal and republican, the Slovak Catholics reactionary and pro-Nazi. When the Republic was dissolved by the betrayal of Munich, a Catholic priest, Monsignor Joseph Tiso, who had been in prison, escaped, flew to Berlin, and made a deal with Hitler. Between March and May, 1939, at least a thousand Jews were arrested for no reason except race and religion, and a government program announced which was purely anti-Semitic. This, in a country ruled by a Catholic priest. And no word of criticism from the Vatican.

On the other hand there are Catholic papers, priests, notable laymen, organizations, and numerous Popes who today and in the past have not only denounced anti-Semitism, but also have actually been the friends of distressed and persecuted Jews.

Naturally enough, *The Catholic Worker* is the enemy of this racial hatred; in real labor unions there is not (or should not be) any place for creed, color, blood, or other prejudices. *The Worker* declared years ago that "if there is anyone who has any anti-Semitic feeling he or she should communicate with *The Catholic Worker* and we will tear away the veil of ignorance. . . . We intend . . . to spike every rumor and whisper that reaches our ears. It is not enough to appreciate the fact that the small time organizations engaged in this despicable business of spreading hate, are composed of men-

tally diseased morons. We must inform the healthy minded bystanders of true Christian teachings on this subject."

And as more and more evidence of anti-Semitism among Catholics has accumulated, *The Catholic Worker* has published more and more protests in its columns. It denounced an organization calling itself "The Christian Front" (but not the one of the same name sponsored by the magazine edited by Richard Deverall, nor yet another which is not Catholic), and it attacked both Father Coughlin and one of his strongest backers, Patrick Scanlan of the *Brooklyn Tablet*. It hoped the Jews of America "will consider both cases not in the light of anti-Semitism but rather as two cases of extraordinarily bad manners." This pious hope could be entertained if Coughlin and Scanlan had not become the leaders in anti-Semitic propaganda approved by hundreds of thousands of Protestant and Catholic followers.

We have also the Catholic College Press Association, speaking for 17,000 students, adopting a resolution expressing "deep anxiety over the rising tide of anti-Jewish feeling in the world. They hold that anti-Semitism, repeatedly denounced by the Pope as un-Christian and immoral, is also a crime against true Americanism and democracy." The Catholic Association for International Peace has published a pamphlet, *The Church and the Jews*, a ringing indictment of anti-Semitism which quotes great Catholic leaders protesting "the prevalent poisonous atmosphere of falsehood and hate."

As for the Popes, "it is well known," writes Fr. O'Hare, "how in the Middle Ages the Jews were constantly and uniformly protected by the Popes, even in Rome itself." In fact, in 1807 there was a Sanhedrin held in Paris where a resolution was adopted saying that "at divers times the Roman Popes have given protection and refuge in their territories to the persecuted Jews from all parts of Europe." St. Gregory, Pope Alexander II (who, Lecky says, tried to stop the per-

secution of Jews which lasted until the French Revolution), St. Bernard, Innocent II, Alexander III, Gregory IX, all helped or protected the Jews. Clement VI gave them asylum in Avignon. And Pope Pius XI, shortly before his death in 1939, at a time when anti-Semitism was reaching the most horrible and bloody depths in Europe and increasing among the morons in America, made the clearest statement possible on Catholic attitude, a statement on ethical conduct which unfortunately the Coughlins and Scanlans ignore. Speaking to a group of radio-station directors, the Sovereign Pontiff referred to the sacrifice of Abel, of Abraham, and of Melchisedech, linked them with the sacrifice of Jesus, and concluded:

Sacrifice of Abel, sacrifice of Abraham, sacrifice of Melchisedech. In three acts, in three links, in three stages, behold the whole religious history of humanity. Sacrifice of Abel; era of Adam. Sacrifice of Abraham; era of religion and wonderful history of Israel. Sacrifice of Melchisedech; announcement of the Christian era and religion.

Noblest of texts! Each time We read it We are overcome with an inexpressible emotion.

Sacrificium Patriarche Nostri Abrahae (Sacrifice of Abraham, our Patriarch). Note well how Abraham is called our patriarch, our ancestor.

Anti-Semitism is *not compatible with the thought and sublime realities which are expressed in this text. It is a movement to which we cannot, we Christians, have any part whatsoever.*

Concerning the promise made to Abraham and his descendants, the text does not say, Saint Paul remarks, "in *Seeds*, meaning plural, but in the *Seed*, meaning one which is Christ" (*in seminibus, tamquam in pluribus, sed in semine, tamquam in uno, quod est Christus*). Through Christ and in Christ we are the *Spiritual descendants of Abraham*. No, it is not possible for Christian to participate in anti-Semitism. We acknowledge the right of everyone to defend himself, to take legitimate

measures to protect himself against all that menaces his legitimate interests. *But anti-Semitism is inadmissible. Spiritually, we are Semites.*

It is obvious, therefore, that if all Catholics followed the precepts of Christianity and listened to the words of the Pope there could be no anti-Semitism among them—just as there could not be among Protestants who were also Christians. But nevertheless there is, and the fact cannot be overlooked.

One reason for it is the success anti-Semites, mostly German Nazis, have had in linking Jews with "Reds." The "smear technique" of giving your enemy a bad name, and then attacking him as being that bad name, whether or not the name fits, has been exposed by institutes and specialists in propaganda analysis, but the sowers of hate have big funds and loud mouths, and when they can have the services of a Father Coughlin on a national radio hook-up, they can spread more semitruths and misstatements in an hour than can be replaced by the decent and honest truth in a year.

The Jesuit weekly *America* continues to demand that American Jews declare themselves opposed to Communism "and thus refute a charge that seemed to be well-founded and that was all too well-believed." Parts of the Catholic press and many leaders of the hierarchy cannot stop using the myth of Jewish connection with Communism to criticize the Jews, because certain Jews, mostly of the intellectual and working class, have volunteered as soldiers or supported the medical bureau which did humanitarian work in Loyalist Spain, or because the Jews are said not to have protested the killing of priests in Spain, or because a distinction between Spain and Germany has been made by Jews and Gentiles alike. To the strictures of Mr. Michael Williams, *The Nation* replied: "that bishop after bishop, priest after priest, has used the persecution of minorities in Germany as a basis for

making the most calculatingly fraudulent comparison in recent history—that false and unscrupulous parallel between the fate of the Jews in Germany and that of the Catholics in Spain. Here is one of those gargantuan distortions which seem so obviously false that no one bothers to straighten them out until they have an unbreakable hold on the public mind. Germany is a country at peace; Spain is a country in the midst of war. In Germany the Jews are persecuted and put to death solely because by chance of birth they are Jews, regardless of their political or religious beliefs; in Spain Catholics are persecuted by other Catholics because they are ranged on opposite sides in a social and political struggle. There are priests on both sides, and if those who are on the side of the insurgents are treated just as all other avowed enemies are treated in war time, it may be pointed out that devout Catholic Basques—priests as well as laymen—are not treated otherwise by the forces of General Franco. Yet it is on the bases of such deceptive comparisons that the Catholic church is waging the fight to maintain the Spanish embargo. . . .”

The fact remains that with the Pope and the intellectual and liberal and labor elements of Catholicism opposed to it, there is as much anti-Semitism among Catholics as there is proportionately among other sects in America. In Europe, of course, there was more anti-Semitism in Catholic countries than elsewhere until Hitler began his massacres.

To those who find grounds for optimism in the fact that rumors of still greater anti-Semitism in America are untrue, another cold fact must be told: the present parity of anti-Semitism means a considerable recent increase of it among Catholics.

In the *post-bellum* period, especially from 1920 to 1926, when Ku Klux Klanism made its greatest progress (a time of depression, leading into prosperity, and unlike the present decade of unrelieved depression), many minority groups

were being persecuted. Catholics and Jews alike were the victims. And, naturally, they had a bond in common, the bond of suffering, injustice, of being the victims of terrorism and brutality. Both were then on the defensive, and there was very little anti-Semitism among the Catholics.

Anti-Semitism has increased among Catholics slowly in the past decade, and notably since the outbreak of the Spanish war. It has run parallel with a change of attitude. If it can be said that Catholicism was more than less on the defensive in the third decade of the present century, it can also be said that American Catholics have become more and more on the aggressive in the present decade.

These extraordinary and powerful Catholic pressures constitute an important phenomenon in our present political and social life.

CHAPTER 3

Catholic Reactionary Pressures

ACCEPTING Mussolini's own definition of Fascism as Reaction, we can continue to discuss the problem of the Catholic Church, hierarchy and masses, both in America and elsewhere, examining the facts on both sides.

"The reactionary policies of many Catholics, in both the political and social spheres," admits Father E. Harold Smith,¹ "have added to the weight of the trials under which the Church has been forced to labor."

What are these reactionary policies? Here follows a list of *charges* which have been made lately, some by Catholics, some by non-Catholics, some perhaps by anti-Catholics, charges which may be true, or false, or half-true, but which nevertheless must be taken into account in an open discussion of the Catholic crisis. The majority of them, it must be said at once, come from friendly, liberal sources, and are not intended to harm or embarrass the Church. In most instances the various allegations are preceded by the statement that they apply only to certain Catholic journals, or leaders, or members of the hierarchy, and not to the liberal and democratic rank and file. Here they are:

1. The Catholics have intimidated and terrorized the entire United States press on the Spanish issue;
2. Denied the constitutional right of free speech to other minorities;

¹ *The Commonweal*, Jan. 1, 1937.

3. Nullified the wishes of the American majority through pressure on Congress on the Spanish and other problems;
4. Censored the movies of the nation from the Catholic viewpoint;
5. Suppressed books and other publications, some for moral reasons, others for sectarian reasons;
6. Boycotted, threatened boycotts, or ruined the business of certain persons favoring Loyalist Spain;
7. Forced their minority view on Child Labor legislation through the New York and other legislatures;
8. Intimidated the owners of various radio stations on moral and controversial and political subjects;
9. Threatened violence to liberals and radicals in certain cities;
10. Built up Fascist political machines and gangs, as in Jersey City;
11. Defeated, or helped to defeat, numerous city, state and national measures of a reformist and liberal tendency; helped maintain or inaugurated legislation of an anti-Liberal, antilabor, anti-Progressive or reactionary nature at various times;
12. Permitted spokesmen to spread anti-Semitism, hatred, prejudice, and a part of its press to do likewise;
13. Interfered with the purchase of books in public libraries, attempting to eliminate liberal books; also intimidated bookshops selling books Catholics think immoral;
14. "Determined and incessant efforts to embroil the United States with Mexico" . . . contributions "to attempted counter-revolutions";
15. Instigated raids on birth-control lectures, clinics, bookshops;
16. Made decent changes in our marriage and divorce laws impossible;
17. Indulged in unadulterated Red baiting side by side and often in cooperation with America's No. 1 Fascist, W. R. Hearst;
18. Generally allied themselves with non-Catholic reactionary

pressure groups which have menaced the civil liberties of the majority.

Whether these eighteen items include all "the reactionary policies of many Catholics in the social and political spheres" about which Father Smith generalized, the present writer does not know, but it is apparent that some of them are fact and that others need explanation, perhaps refutation. At any rate, a large part of the following chapters will be devoted to analyzing some of these charges of undue pressures.

In several instances, now well known to the public, it is true that the pressure group among the Catholics, that is, a minority among a minority of our citizenry, has succeeded in voiding the will of the American people. In some instances it is also obvious that this Catholic minority has voided the will of the Catholic masses.

The most flagrant examples of this fact occurred, of course, during the Spanish Civil War, when, as we have already shown by the Gallup Poll, the Catholic majority was not for Franco. The majority of all Americans favored the Loyalists. But the Catholic minority pressure machine prevented the American people from expressing its sympathy and from extending its aid to the Republic. Everyone now admits that it was Catholic pressure and fear of Catholic reprisals against Congressmen rather than British pressure which kept on the embargo against the Loyalists, and therefore more than any other factor caused the defeat of the Loyalists in Catalonia, where they were outgunned ten to one, and driven from the air by ten or twenty Nazi and Fascist planes against one American or Russian-built plane which ran the blockade.

It was Catholic pressure, organized and supported by 90 or more per cent of the Catholic press and a large majority of the hierarchy which negated the democratic desire of the American people. It was a victory of organization, pressure,

intimidation, even terrorization of politicians and perhaps statesmen; it was a victory for boycott and the threat of boycott, for the terrorization of the free press which would have been for Republican Spain were it not for this action. It goes into history as a Catholic victory, perhaps, but it certainly did not represent the will of the majority of the Catholics, and this majority will have difficulty—not controlling its own press—to state its position when reaction makes itself felt, and accuses not the minority pressurites but the Church and its mass of followers as a whole.

It is such a flagrant episode as the foregoing that causes the liberal, tolerant Protestant weekly, *The Christian Century*, which has been a frank critic of the Catholic Church for many years, and accepted at one time its leadership in the movie campaign and other moral crusades, to call attention now to its growing doubts and that of multitudes. It has always deplored bigotry against Catholics. It says now² that “no critical person can fail to notice the change which recent years have brought in liberal attitudes toward Roman Catholicism.” Until only the other day, it points out, Liberals were protesting the bigotry of ignorant and evil-intentioned persons against the followers of the Pope. “Today the shoe is on the other foot. The same temper which deplored the intolerance partly responsible for the defeat of Alfred E. Smith, Roman Catholic candidate for the presidency, in 1929, must now itself combat the Catholic Church on several fronts. What are the reasons for this reversal?”

The answer, Mr. Saunders believes, is the sudden fruitage of a long policy, since there has been no fundamental shift. “Our time, however,” he continues, “has seen the enormous growth of activities of the Catholic Church in such diverse fields as education, politics, birth control, foreign affairs, the

² “Liberals and Catholic Action,” by D. A. Saunders, *The Christian Century*, Oct. 20, 1937.

movies, and the like. Such activities, represented as 'Catholic Action,' are in almost every case squarely opposed to the liberal position. And Catholic Action today is alienating the support of those liberals who have so often defended Catholicism against its bigoted enemies."

At this point Catholic spokesmen would protest the use of the title "Catholic Action" by Mr. Saunders. Pope Pius XI's definition was simply "Catholic life, openly professed and militant," also as "lay participation in the apostolate of the hierarchy," and other definitions have restricted the "action" to bringing the religious ideal into everyday life. Teeling declares that "the Pope, rightly or wrongly, is determined that the Catholic laity shall be organized to help the Catholic clergy, and rightly or wrongly, he has termed the organisation which he requires in each country, 'Catholic Action.' This term gives a certain militant touch to the whole organisation, and aggravates to a possibly unnecessary extent numbers of people who would otherwise be quite tolerant about Catholicism. Catholic Action differs slightly in each country." That is true. But in America, for instance, Catholic Action is not supposed to include participation in nonchurchly activities. It would be well, therefore, to differentiate between Catholic Action and Catholics in action.

Mr. Saunders' examples to which he objects are the following: Father Ignatius Cox of Fordham University rushed to the American Medical Association convention to organize Catholic doctors against the A.M.A.'s proposal that doctors give out birth-control information; the Boston hierarchy's political activities regarding birth-control clinics; the raiding of the Birth Control League; the seizure of records in Salem and Brookline clinics after criminal charges were made against staff members; the bill providing free transportation for parochial students passed in New Hampshire; the virtual censorship over books and movies by the Legion of Decency,

"a most powerful phase of Catholic Action"; the Knights of Columbus investigation of the movie actor Errol Flynn accused of raising money for Loyalist Spain; action against all Hollywood producers, stars and writers favoring the Spanish Republic and the threats against exhibitors of "more drastic action."

"Such an attitude is frankly outrageous to the liberal mind. When is a scene or a movie to be construed as subversive? And by whom? Will this self-appointed censorship be administered in the spirit of Mrs. Dilling's famous 'Red Network?' Hardly less distasteful to the liberal is the characteristic method of approach: under the cover of morality, strictly political ends are achieved. Only a veto by Governor Lehman prevented the successful application of this method to the New York stage: after a drive on smutty burlesque houses, in which all denominations took part, every Catholic pressure was brought to pass the Dunnigan bill, which would have given full licensing and censorship power over stage plays to a single Albany official."

The opposition to the child labor amendment on the ground that it would take children away from their parents and institute governmental control, is called "sheer hypocrisy." But the severest of all strictures are reserved for "the most impressive phase of Catholic Action in recent years . . . the world-wide red-baiting campaign, and the open or implied support of Fascism which went with it." Mr. Saunders gives startling examples of Fascist actions by Catholic bodies and leading politicians and quotes from the booklet prepared by Bishop John F. Noll of Indiana which applauds Fascism, by contrasting it with Communism. "All of these activities," concludes the writer in *The Christian Century*, "have something in common: their effect is to set the Roman Catholic apart from the rest of the nation. There is a Catholic attitude toward medicine, politics, movies and foreign affairs. It is not

science that matters, but Catholic science. Catholics are organized as such to further the extra-religious aims of the church. This increasing tendency to form a permanent minority, to insulate the Catholic group from the processes of democratic society, is the very heart of the reason for the anti-Catholic movements of the past. If Catholic Action persists in its present outlook, I am certain that the future will see the birth of new and more dangerous anti-Catholic movements. Why, then, should the Church pursue unswervingly so dangerous a course? Why do not the numerous liberal Catholics speak up?"

The numerous liberal Catholics do speak up—and for the majority frequently if not for those in power in the press and pulpit. Many of them shall be quoted here. First of all, let us look at the Catholic viewpoint. Reviewing Catholic activities for 1938, *The Catholic News* of December 31 considers the following notable:

The fight against the Reorganization bill. [Here as usual we had a division between reactionaries and progressives. Cardinal Mundelein telegraphed the President he could not find "that the welfare or freedom of the Catholic Church is in any way menaced by the pending Reorganization Bill," but the Coughlinites and like forces helped destroy a necessary piece of legislation].

The fight to keep the embargo on Loyalist Spain.

Attack on the proposed Equal Rights Amendment.

Endorsement of amendments to New York State Constitution which favored the Church; disapproval of certain others.

Fight on Communism. [That this campaign degenerated into plain Hearstian red-baiting quite frequently was noted by only a small minority of the Catholic press].

Attack on a Young Women's Christian Association summer camp in Michigan, accused of "inculcating class hatred." Here the instigator, Bishop Joseph H. Schlarmann of Peoria, received

the assurances that there would be no more "pink summer schools."

Terrific onslaught on those congressmen who sent greetings to the Spanish congress on its opening.

Attempt to curtail franking privilege to the Spanish official and legal embassy.

Attack on Cordell Hull for protesting the murder of civilians in Barcelona by the Franco Nazi and Fascist planes.

Attack on government employees for taking up collection for Loyalist Spain.

Vigorous protest against the 61 Protestant and Methodist clerics who protested the murder of civilians in Spain.

Protest, boycott, intimidation of movie theaters showing the film *Blockade* (passed by the Catholic censors).

All the foregoing fights, attacks, protests, are legal and ethical, and do not tell the whole story. *The Catholic News* summary does not mention more violent, terroristic and illegal actions in which Catholic groups or organizations participated. But it is clear that all the actions taken have an illiberal, anti-liberal and reactionary animus behind them, as the few liberal Catholic papers and priests have also pointed out, and do not perhaps represent the viewpoint of any but the ruling minority in the Church.

The Catholic war on birth control furnishes a good example of the two pressures, one legal and ethical, the other at least unethical, if not illegal. The most dramatic episode in the war was The Battle of Town Hall, in November 1921, the details of which can be found in the New York papers of November 14. But although the reporters then heard that Archbishop (later Cardinal) Hayes, and not the legal authorities, had commanded the bluecoats that night, the story was so incredible that an extra day was taken to confirm it, and when it was fully admitted and confirmed, the headlines read: ³

³ *New York Times*.

BIRTH CONTROL RAID
MADE BY POLICE ON
ARCHBISHOP'S ORDER

Captain Donohue's only instructions
from headquarters were to
"look for Msgr. Dineen"

Here, in short, is the amazing story. Margaret Sanger, as is well known, led the fight for the teaching of birth control in America and her chief antagonist was the Catholic Church, the Pope himself having issued an encyclical, *Casti Connubii* (Of Chaste Marriage), in 1931 about that and kindred matters. In the early days the New York police terrorized even those publications which announced a biographical sketch of Mrs. Sanger, or a factual statement of what she proposed to do. Even the mention of the dread words "birth control" led to visits from patrolmen and detectives, as the present writer well knows, having announced an article on the subject in *Pulitzer's Review*, a magazine he then edited.

In planning her Town Hall meeting, Mrs. Sanger invited the Archbishop to participate, and thus tipped him off to the event, but neither he nor a substitute welcomed the opportunity to present the opposite side. The hall filled up early. In her *Autobiography*, Mrs. Sanger tells how the meeting was broken up:

Meanwhile, Anne Kennedy was telling me as best she could what had happened prior to my arrival. When the house had been half filled, a man had come to the platform and asked, "Who's in charge?"

"I am," Anne had answered.

"This meeting must be closed."

"Why?"

"An indecent, immoral subject is to be discussed. It cannot be held."

"On what authority? Are you from the police?"

"No, I'm Monsignor Dineen, the Secretary of Archbishop Hayes."

"What right has he to interfere?"

"He has the right." Here he turned to a policeman. "Captain, speak up."

"Who are you?" Anne had demanded.

"I'm Captain Donohue of this district. The meeting must be stopped."

Capable and cool-headed Anne had replied, "Very well, we'll write this down and I'll read it to the audience. 'I, Captain Thomas Donohue, of the Twenty-sixth Precinct, at the order of Monsignor Joseph P. Dineen, Secretary to Archbishop Patrick J. Hayes, have ordered this meeting closed.'"

The listeners had sat petrified while she had read them this strange admission. No hissing or booing then. They had just sat. It was one thing to have the hall shut by a mistaken or misguided police captain; a very different thing to have it done by a high dignitary of the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

Monsignor Dineen was now stationed in the back of the hall, and Anne pointed him out to me, of medium size, in plain attire, calmly directing the police by a casual nod of the head or a whisper to a man who acted as runner between him and the Captain on the platform. . . .

. . . A *Times* reporter called up the "*Power House*," as St. Patrick's Cathedral was colloquially termed, reached Dineen himself, and asked for verification. "Yes," said the Monsignor, "we closed the meeting."

Here is a report from the contemporary press: The first complaint, it was admitted at the archiepiscopal residence, was made at the archbishop's direction sometime before the meeting, and Monsignor Dineen went to the Town Hall before the meeting. Captain Donohue did not know why he had been sent to the Town Hall until he met the Monsignor there. The instructions from police headquarters to Captain

Donohue were merely to go to Town Hall and "Look up Monsignor Dineen, who had made a complaint about a birth control meeting." When the magistrate dismissed the case against Mrs. Sanger and her friends he said to the police captain: "How can you stop anything when it has not started?"

The purely dictatorial action on the part of the leading Catholic cleric of New York caused a great uproar, which was increased when neither Captain Donohue nor Monsignor Dineen appeared in court to explain. The entire press denounced this infringement of free speech and the right of assembly. The *Tribune* was very angry. Mrs. Ogden Reid had been at the meeting. Mrs. Sanger denounced "the brazen hand of an ecclesiastical order in an attempt to usurp the power of the state"; she called her arrest "the first sign of an encroaching fifteenth century medievalism," and was spurred to continue her fight.

In Albany a hall was denied her because the police commissioner was a Catholic, Mrs. Sanger writes, and in Cincinnati the Knights of Columbus tried to get her and her associates put out of their hotel. In Syracuse, in Milwaukee, in many cities and towns the Catholic organizations protested her presence and her right to speak.

Eventually a bill was proposed which would safeguard the general public from the misuse of contraceptives, and Mrs. Sanger thought that this at least would meet with the approval of the hierarchy. She consulted leaders of the Catholic Welfare Conference, physicians, prelates. "But," she concludes, "they unequivocally set forth their objections; not even a physician's indisputable right to save lives swayed them. They declared it was their office to see that no 'social or moral' legislation passed Congress that did not conform to the tenets of Catholic doctrine; they would attempt to prevent any such bill from becoming a law." A report of the

interview containing the foregoing statement was shown to the notables interviewed, and returned essentially unchanged.

The episode leads to three conclusions: 1. police action was usurped by the archbishop of New York; 2. pressure was brought to an unusual degree to prevent free speech on a subject which the Catholic Church does not approve, and 3. the Catholic viewpoint on this important subject is intended by its adherents to be made the law of the nation. It is true that times have changed in the past two decades, and that the American Medical Association has studied birth control, and that birth control more or less is practiced by millions, including Catholics, but the fight to make the Catholic viewpoint the American law on the subject still goes on.

Boycott is a legal method of registering one's protest, and no one on the liberal side would want that right denied. In fact, it is the reactionaries who protest the boycott, and especially a form known as "secondary" in which the advertiser in a newspaper on strike, for example, is made the victim. Boycott is one of the weapons of labor.

But now we find Catholic organizations attempting by boycott to destroy the livelihood of numerous persons and companies who have exercised their right to help their fellow men in Spain. And this boycott extends even to humanitarians.

In April 1938 the St. Apollonia Guild of New York (Catholic dentists) wrote and publicized a boycott of the Novocol Chemical Manufacturing Company, of which Dr. Mendell Nevin is president, because the latter had contributed about \$250 worth of local anesthetics to a clinic operating in Spain "for the purpose of relieving the suffering of the injured and sick, irrespective of political beliefs, religion, race, or affiliations." The company had previously made contributions to the American Red Cross, the Y.M.C.A., the

Salvation Army, Catholic, Protestant and Jewish clinics and hospitals. It also employs numerous Catholics. But it could not allay the wrath of the Catholic dentists group which decided not to withdraw its boycott even after an explanation of impartiality and freedom from the "red" taint had been made. St. Apollonia's followers were unconcerned with the Hippocratic Oath, with humanitarian work, with medical ethics; it was not interested in the horrors and pain of the wounded in Spain—provided the wounded were Loyalists. They should have no anesthetics. St. Apollonia's spokesman, Willard T. Keane, wrote to the *Brooklyn Tablet* that the Guild is indisposed to change its attitude. He is incensed because the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy has listed the Novocol company as a donor of dental supplies.

Moreover, this unfeeling letter discloses the fact that the Guild, which names itself after a saint, had intimidated all other contributors to the Spanish hospitals by writing to them, presumably under threat of boycott, to ask that their names be taken off the Spanish bureau's list of friends. Mr. Keane concludes that the medical bureau "is distinctly partisan and is supporting a cause which is bitterly opposed to all things Catholic." Is this medical ethics? In my time in the World War American doctors cared for the German wounded along with American wounded in the field hospitals. The Germans were not left to suffer pain for want of anesthetics, as the St. Apollonians would have the Loyalists do in Spain.

Another form of Catholic pressure is that against Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, our First Lady, who has either been capable of leading or elected to lead a public life of her own. Mrs. Roosevelt is obviously liberal in her views. She has seen marriages in her own family spoil and culminate in divorces; she has seen the launching of movements for human betterment which she has approved despite the howls of the reactionaries; she had favored the Loyalists in Spain; she has

read books and seen motion pictures which others would suppress. Naturally Mrs. Roosevelt has been under continual attack from the extreme Right, and certain Catholic leaders and bodies on all these points.

"I never think honest things are bad," said Mrs. Roosevelt before she had seen the picture "Birth of a Baby." After she had seen it, she said it would be a valuable experience for young people about to be married but doubted the wisdom of exhibiting it to general audiences. A Gallup Poll showed that 77 per cent who had seen stills in *Life* approved the picture.

But against both enlightened and majority opinion various Catholic groups went into action. Their fight on the picture itself will be detailed in another chapter. As for Mrs. Roosevelt, the question was raised whether or not the wife of a president ought to have the same rights, under the Constitution, as ordinary American citizens. Patrick Scanlan, in his editorial department in the *Brooklyn Tablet*, applauding the Legion of Decency for boycotting "objectionable films"—which, incidentally, had been passed by the Catholics who control Hollywood censorship—suggested that "perhaps pickets should march around the White House." He concludes, "And if we had no Mrs. Roosevelt (meaning mother of Eleanor Roosevelt) mothers and others would not be blushing for shame at the cheap, inane and common remarks of Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt." James F. Langan, Grand Knight of the Knights of Columbus, attacked the First Lady's views on divorce. Mrs. Charles Feehan, president of the League of Catholic Women, "assailed Mrs. Roosevelt for making pronouncements that give offense to a large part of our citizens." She was accused of taking advantage unfairly of her position; of making "unfortunate, unfair, dangerous and apodictical" statements, of being disrespectful to the "decencies and sanctities of life." In both instances, as regards divorce and

the showing of educative films, Mrs. Roosevelt happened to be with the majority, as well as within her rights as a citizen.

Here is an example from abroad: in Switzerland, in March 1938, Professor Johannes Ude, eminent teacher at the University of Graz and internationally known Catholic pacifist, was forbidden to speak in public by the bishops of the dioceses of Basel, Lugano, St. Gallen and Chur. The bishops threatened to forbid the celebration of the mass to this Franciscan theologian, who, at sixty-five, holds four doctorates and is the author of twenty-five scientific books and seventy-six pamphlets.

Professor Ude holds to the theory, which he claims is that of the founders of Christianity, that "resistance to military service is a sacred duty from the point of view of Catholic morality," but the bishops stop him from speaking because they believe he gives "the impression that the Catholic Church is on a false road." In 1929 the bishop of Graz and other bishops put a ban on Professor Ude which lasted until 1935. At that time he wrote an open letter attacking Mussolini's violation of law and morality in the Ethiopian campaign, and was fined 1,600 shillings by the civil authorities. He was also placed "on leave" from the university, that institution being afraid to dismiss him because of public opinion. Professor Ude wears the plain dress of the Third Order of Franciscans, is bareheaded and barefoot, except for sandals. Lately he has been studying and speaking about the wrongs of the present economic order and the economic causes of war. In his letter submitting to the orders of the Swiss bishops he says he cannot understand "why such heavy punishments are ordered against me."

- And an American example: here is Archbishop John J. Glennon of St. Louis approving in January 1939 of the action of St. Louis University and the Rev. Harry B. Crim-

mins, its president, in dismissing Dr. Moyer Springer Fleisher who headed the bacteriology department of the school of medicine. The cause was simple. Dr. Fleisher was one of the sponsors who almost two years earlier had attended a meeting under the auspices of the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy. The speaker was called "an unfrocked priest" by the Jesuit college authorities, and Father Crimmins added that the university "took no official position on the Spanish question" and recognizes the right of an individual faculty member to his private opinions, adding that a Catholic school, under Jesuit control, "could not countenance one of its faculty members publicly sponsoring a speaker who has taken every occasion to speak offensively of the Catholic Church, its officials and its doctrines." And so academic freedom was outlawed in this Catholic institution.

Or take all the various gag laws, teachers' oaths, Red riders, and the like which every organization interested in civil liberties, and notably the American Civil Liberties Unions—which has had many of the nation's most notable liberal Catholics on its board of directors, New York committee, etc.—are fighting. One finds that in many cases Catholic bishops and Catholic institutions try to get the majority of Catholics to support measures frequently unconstitutional and antidemocratic.

Governor Lehman of New York in 1938 vetoed the McNaboe bill which would bar radicals from public office. There had been some four thousand requests that the bill be signed, and almost as many against it. A study of the flood of letters, telegrams, petitions, etc., showed exactly what the readers now suspect, that many Catholic organizations demanded the signature, and many libertarian organizations asked for a veto. The press at the time reported that "the Catholic Church in Albany took a stand squarely for the bill when Bishop Gibbons of the diocese wrote a letter

which was read at church services." Bishop Gibbons, who mixes into New York state politics on almost every possible occasion, had written:

The McNaboe-Devany Anti-Communistic Bill, passed by the legislature and now in the hands of the governor, provides a wholesome check on subversive activities.

I suggest you call the attention of the people to it at the Masses next Sunday and follow up with telegrams to the governor urging him to sign the bill. Request church societies and fraternal organizations to do likewise.

The bill was obviously unconstitutional. But neither the bishop nor the pressure groups paused in their headlong Red-baiting campaign to consider that little matter.

The campaign against the appointment of a Communist party member, Simon W. Gerson, a newspaper reporter, to the staff of Borough President Stanley Isaacs of New York, was conducted in a similar manner. No question of legality of Communists holding office was discussed, nor the fitness of the appointee. But "the Roman Catholic-Tammany alliance, always powerful in New York City, went after Gerson's scalp." After several devious attacks, "a new investigation was trumped up by State Senator John J. McNaboe conspicuous among the hunters of Red witches in New York. . . . The incident is memorable chiefly because it shows the lengths to which the Catholic Church is prepared to go, and the influence it wields. We regret to note the sorry role played in this affair by two supposedly liberal newspapers—the *New York World Telegram* and the *Post*. These papers showed a disheartening tendency to stand with the enemies of freedom. Their policy, if carried out, would drive the Communist Party underground and make it far

more important, in the long run, than it is today, with its 75,000 members in a voting population of 65,000,000." ⁴

The Catholic protest, although stupid, was legal. That the Church entered into a political scrap is evident from these facts: the churches were used for the distribution of pamphlets of a Red-baiting and insulting nature. At least twenty churches in the four boroughs were scenes of this witch hunt one Sunday, and the Rev. Edward Lodge Curran, head of the International Truth Society of Brooklyn, boasted that almost every church would eventually be used for that purpose if Gerson were not fired. In some churches priests urged parishioners to take the pamphlets home, read them, and write protests to Mr. Isaacs.

The pressures range from the illegal to the ridiculous. A painter named Ben Shahn is commissioned to do one of a series of murals for the New York post office. He chooses the good gray poet Walt Whitman reading to the citizens one of his verses:

Brain of the new world! What a task is thine!
To formulate the Modern out of the peerless grandeur of the
Modern
Out of thyself—comprising science to recast Poems, Churches, Art
(Recast—maybe discard them—end them—maybe their work is
done, who knows?)
By vision, hand, conception, on the background of the mighty
past, the dead,
To limn with absolute faith the mighty living present.

No one was offended but Father Ignatius W. Cox, who did not recognize the "bearded old teacher" nor the poem. He smelled "government propaganda for irreligion." The poem he found "vague" with a "note of religious skepticism. . . . The wording is an insult to all religious-minded men

⁴ *New Republic*, June 1, 1938.

and to Christianity. It does indulge in propaganda for ir-religion." The mural should not be executed. The poem "implies the background for two false and fatal pseudo-messianic movements which are competing with Christianity for the allegiance of men's mind. They are Bolshevism of the Russian Asiatic type and Nazism of the European type. . . ."

Poor old Walt Whitman, father of Bolshevism and Nazism at the same Brooklyn moment!

But before he learned who the poet was, Father Cox was already ordering his congregation to write protests to the postmaster.

The most interesting development among Catholic reactionary activities recently has been the union with non-Catholic Fascists. This fact should occasion no surprise, as it is all part of the same pattern which has not changed fundamentally in the second European War. It still runs from Berlin to Burgos, from Tokyo to the Shrine of the Little Flower, from Bund headquarters in 86th Street to the Palazzo Venezia, to Tompkins Corner, in the State of New York, to an office in the Tribune Tower in Chicago from where Judge H. W. Rogers (retired) and Harry Jung of the American Vigilantes, respectively, mail the same "literature" which Goebbels distributes.

It's always fair weather when good Fascists get together. In the American Liberty League no religious question is raised. So long as the issue is reaction, the fight against the general welfare of the masses of the people, organized labor, the third of a nation which is dispossessed, and all the other victims of the tiny minority which enjoys all the blessings of the machine and power age, no question of race or religion is raised. Any Protestant, Catholic or Jew can join the Liberty League, and the more he contributes to the fund the better his colleagues will think of him. Al Smith gets

no blackball because he is a Catholic, nor does any Jewish Fascist find difficulty in making this club. No one asks if the Raskobs, du Ponts, Schwabs, or other employers of labor and merchants of death are Protestants or Catholics or Jews.

It is the same in the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the superpatriotic societies.

In fact, the bankers and brokers who tried to persuade General Smedley Butler to lead a march of veterans on Washington in 1935 to capture the government and establish a Fascist regime were of all religious factions.

Otto H. Kahn supported Mussolini as fervently as Thomas W. Lamont of the House of Morgan.⁵ Congressman Sol Bloom and Senator David A. Reed agreed that Mussolini was good for Italy and the rest of the world. William Randolph Hearst, Al Capone, Commander-in-Chief Alvin Owsley of the American Legion (in 1923), Isaac L. Marcossan, Irvin S. Cobb, Kenneth L. Roberts, Governor Curley of Massachusetts, Thomas J. Watson of the International Business Machine Corporation, have endorsed Mussolini and Fascism. Charles E. Sorensen, general manager of the Ford Motor company, and Charles M. Schwab of Bethlehem have returned from Europe full of praise for Hitler and the Nazi regime.

All the present-day Fascists, Catholic and non-Catholic, are professional or super patriots. (Patriotism, said Dr. Johnson, is the last refuge of a scoundrel.) They rally round the flag and spread their poison in the guise of Americanism. On the occasion of the exposure of the plan to organize all these "patriotic" organizations into a federation and to provide an army and invite General Moseley to take over the American Government, the Descendants of the American

⁵ Cf. *The Fascist Pattern: Men*, Chapter 16, in *You Can't Do That*, Modern Age, publisher, 1938.

Revolution issued a statement warning the country against "fascist-inspired subversive groups masquerading as ultra-patriotic in order to mislead genuine patriotic societies into accepting their un-American philosophy." The warning concluded:

The Descendants of the American Revolution urges all patriotic organizations to reject courageously and publicly membership in a coalition promoted and inspired by such proponents of hatred, intolerance and prejudice as George Van Horn Moseley, Fritz Kuhn, Charles E. Coughlin, George Deatherage, William D. Pelley, Robert Edmondson, Gerald Winrod, Gerald Smith, Senator Reynolds, Allen Zoll, George W. Christians, Henry Allen, Colonel Sanctuary, James True and others of such ilk.

It is preparing the ground for fascism in the United States when such individuals take advantage of the prevailing discontent of large sections of the American population to attack the present government, which actually represents the will of the people. Furthermore, it undermines the very democratic foundations of the government itself and betrays the principles for which our forefathers fought and died.

This same reactionary group meets in a magazine called *Patriots Digest* whose officers are: R. Caldwell Patton, president; Clarence M. Chauncey, secretary; Thomas J. Hallowell, treasurer; John E. Kelly, Gault MacGowan, Lambert Fairchild, Edward Lodge Curran and Major William Lathrop Rich, advisory board. If you read through its first issue you will get an excellent picture of what the Fascists of America, Catholic and non-Catholic, want.

Kelly writes a Red-baiting reactionary plea for the disfranchisement of millions of American citizens because they are poor and on relief. There follow two reprints, mean, narrow minded, anti-New Deal, from the *New York Sun* and H. L.

Mencken. Page 15 reprints from *The Catholic News* of March 12, 1938, one of the most atrocious lies of the Spanish War, the claim by one Wladek Zbyszko that he saw the body of a priest hung in a butcher's window with the carcasses of pigs; a department headed "The Red Fist over America" is made up largely from Hearst news items; a cartoon shows an oriental-faced person labeled C.I.O. threatening American labor with a club; there are reprints from the notorious *National Republic*, and from *Spain*, a Franco subsidized organ; in an article by Father Curran the lie which originated in the *London Times* under the irresponsible editorship of the paranoic Lord Northcliffe, that 1,774,647 were killed by the OGPU, is reprinted, Father Curran adding his own statement that "in 1927 the Cheka . . . accepted responsibility"; Father Coughlin is praised for advocating social justice; the Dies committee is approved, also J. B. Matthews of Shirley Temple fame; editorially it is stated the magazine "has no desire to carry the torch for Hitler. . . . Justice demands, however, that the devil be given his due . . ."; and the question is asked whether the C.I.O. is following "the same bloody path" of the French Revolution "and that John L. Lewis or someone like him is already practicing a dress rehearsal for the role of Robespierre"; attacks on the German Bund are deplored and a cartoon favorable to Fritz Kuhn published; an attack on La Guardia by publisher Patton accuses the mayor of New York of being a "little pink perennial, communist candidate," and of Kenneth F. Simpson, Republican leader, it is said he "finagles with the country's most potent radical groups"; the penultimate article is by Gault MacGowan of the *New York Sun*, so full of prejudices and hates that it violates all the ethics of journalism.

There are profits in Red-baiting and reaction, none in liberalism and democracy; the big money is always the Fascist money, and no questions asked about religion. In many of

the pro-Franco organizations in the United States there were no Catholics at all. Here, for example, is a group of Protestants who protested against the appeal sent by 450 Protestant bishops, ministers and laymen to General Franco not to murder all the Loyalist prisoners. Those in favor of showing of Franco mercy are: James Emory Brooks, N. M. Crouse, Knowlton Durham, Ogden H. Hammond, Merwin K. Hart, John Eoghan Kelly, Irwin Laughlin, W. H. Loomis, A. Hamilton Rice and Charlotte Churchill Starr. The Non-Partisan American Committee for Spanish Relief, a purely pro-Fascist organization ⁶ was headed by Basil Harris, vice-president of the International Mercantile Marine and included Ogden H. Hammond, Leon Fraser, vice-president of the First National Bank of New York; General Haskell of the N. Y. National Guard; Joseph P. Grace, shipping magnate; Kelly Graham, president, First National Bank of Jersey City; Thomas F. Woodlock of the *Wall Street Journal* and Frederick H. Prince, the banker. The *New York Post* ⁷ declared the committee was not nonpartisan, that Hammond had denounced the Republic, that Woodlock had written, January 11, that Fascism would be preferable to the Loyalist government, and that the committee should call itself "The American Friends of Spanish Fascism."

In Madrid the Fifth Column was composed of Fascist sympathizers who remained in the city and who, Franco hoped, would knife the Republic in the back. In America, testimony before the Dies committee revealed, all the Fascists, near-Fascists, lunatic fringe reactionaries, and all the crackbrained would-be Führers, attempted to duplicate the Franco plot in the spring of 1939. Dudley P. Gilbert, according to testimony, contributed thousands of dollars toward establishing

⁶ "Planning to serve in territory held by Gen. Franco." *Baltimore Sun*, April 5, 1937, and Associated Press.

⁷ April 16, 1937.

a movement to "save America" because he believed the people would "have to rise under some American officer of the Franco type" in order to prevent a "red revolution." Anti-Semitic correspondence between James Irwin Campbell, colleague of Gilbert's, and Felix M. McWhirter, president of the Peoples State Bank of Indianapolis and in 1934 president of the Red-baiting committee of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, was produced. The chief witness was George Deatherage, commander of the Knights of the White Camellia, who with Campbell planned to set up General Moseley as dictator à la Franco, Mussolini and Hitler. Deatherage proposed to Campbell (according to testimony) that they make contacts with "leaders of main groups throughout the nation," especially Father Coughlin, Gerald Winrod, the Kansas Hitler; Walter Garrison of the Associated Farmers and Homer Chaillaux of the American Legion Americanism commission.

Coughlin, so far as testimony went, was not involved in the alleged conspiracy; he was named merely as one of the persons whose support the proposed American Beer Hall revolutionaries wanted. But Coughlin was and remains the chief rallying figure of all the reactionaries—German Bundists, Italian Fascists, superpatriots and the crackbrained—in the country. In fact, the ultraconservative *Saturday Evening Post*, in an article ⁸ discussing the activities of Fritz Kuhn of the Bund, Hiram Wesley Evans, who has just been superseded as head of the Ku Klux, Deatherage, George W. Christians of the White Shirts, General Moseley, James True, William Dudley Pelley, and their attempt to organize the masses "in the lower-intelligence brackets who can be moved by fear, hate and cupidity," concludes:

"Although this vast network of organizations has no leader, it does have a voice. It was not an oratorical coincidence

⁸ "Star Spangled Fascists," by Stanley High, May 27, 1939.

that, at the recent Bund meeting in Madison Square Garden, the mention of the name of Father Coughlin launched the biggest demonstration of the evening. Generally throughout Fascist circles, Father Coughlin's word is regarded as an authoritative substitute—the more authoritative because it is anti-Jewish—for the law and the prophets. As for the organized anti-Nazis, they put him down as American Fascism's arch-demagogue." Seventy per cent of Coughlin's mail (and possibly financial support) comes from Protestants. Coughlin maintains "an exalted position" in pro-Fascist circles. "When the time comes for the showdown," Deatherage is quoted saying, "Father Coughlin will have behind him, and us, ten million mobilized followers."

At the Bund meeting referred to there were between 16,000 and 19,000 persons present, of whom about 9,000 were not German Bundists but American Coughlinites, mostly Catholics. When Fritz Kuhn spoke, he stopped to let the mob shout and boo as he mentioned name after name, playing the mob like an organist his stops. Those who got the biggest applause were, first, Coughlin, then Hitler, Hoover, Senator Nye, Senator Hiram Johnson, General Hugh Johnson, General Moseley, the Rev. Father Curran of Brooklyn Truth, Congressman Dies, and Mussolini.

The boos, catcalls and filthy shouts were apportioned between the President of the United States, Attorney General Murphy (Catholic), Secretary of Labor Perkins, Secretary of Commerce Hopkins, Secretary of the Interior Ickes, Supreme Court Judge Frankfurter, Walter Winchell, the columnist who invented the term "Ratzis"; Attorney Samuel Untermyer, Bernard Baruch, Congressman Dickstein and former Congressman Amlie whose brother Hans was a captain in the great International Brigade in Spain.

The same star-spangled Fascists appear at the same sort of meetings: to denounce the New Deal, to support Franco, to

cheer Coughlin, to inaugurate Red-baiting campaigns, to fight the child labor amendment, to destroy the W.P.A., to encourage every backward step in social and economic matters and to co-operate with the forces of reaction and cultural death. Sometimes the audience is predominantly non-Catholic, sometimes Catholic. At one meeting (Manhattan Center, New York, December 15, 1938), a Catholic audience made the sign of the cross and recited the Lord's Prayer under the leadership of the Rev. Edward J. Higgins of the Catholic War Veterans, before booing President Roosevelt and cheering Father Coughlin and Congressman Dies. Speakers of several faiths included Justice Herbert A. O'Brien, State Senator John J. McNaboe, Borough President Harvey of Queens and Allen Zoll, who asked the audience to boycott radio station WMCA and put it out of business. (He was later arrested on a charge of attempting to blackmail Donald Flamm, president of the station, on a promise to call off picketing for \$7,500.)

At another meeting "to unite God-fearing Americans against Communism" the speakers were Representative John J. O'Connor (who later made a Catholic issue out of his campaign for re-election), the Rev. Curran and Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling. Fritz Kuhn and Allen Zoll were present and the swastika and Hitler and Mussolini were applauded. At a pro-Franco meeting presided over by Merwin K. Hart, president of the New York State Economic Council, applause was divided between Franco, Hitler, Mussolini and Coughlin. Mr. Hart is the author of a statement that the Falangistas do not want Fascism whereas the official program of the Falangistas is for Fascism. Mr. Hart is also the author of the idea to disenfranchise many million native-born Americans because they are poor. His so-called economic council published⁹ a fifteen-point program which would serve very

⁹ *New York Times*, and other papers, August 6, 1934.

well for any Fascist regime. Mr. Hart has become the chief Protestant spokesman for Franco-Spain and his offices the meeting place of all who favor Hitler and Mussolini as well as Franco. Mr. Hart once publicly accused the President of "communizing the United States." Mr. Hart some time ago organized the American Union for Nationalist Spain whose executive committee includes Father Thorning, Ellery Sedgwick and ex-Ambassador Hammond. The American proposal to send food to both sides during the Spanish struggle was denounced by Hart because he claimed that Franco had enough food; apparently he was willing to let Loyalist children starve to death. He is also the author of a book on Spain which contains numerous statements which are not true, as for example the Falangist stand on Fascism. To substantiate his charge that Franco forestalled a "Red" uprising, Mr. Hart publishes a "document" which has been exposed as a forgery in every capital of Europe. Mr. Hart's documents, said *The Nation* reviewer, H. Rutledge Southworth (June 10, 1939), are "not only forgeries but stupid forgeries." There is not a single book published by the Catholic press in favor of Franco, adds Mr. Southworth, which is distinguished "for anything beyond a hysterical conception of history and a startling disregard for demonstrable fact."

And, as a final illustration, the great meeting at which Father Curran, who is head not only of the International Truth Society of Brooklyn but also of the American Association Against Communism, Incorporated, urged the Church and labor to unite against Communism. The audience of 4,000 booed Mayor La Guardia. Borough President Harvey urged the police to arm themselves with rubber hose and beat up, or perhaps murder ¹⁰ all the Communists. Former

¹⁰ President Harvey is for lynching, apparently. After Goering had said, "We'll hang a communist from every lamppost," Harvey went him one better. "If the Communists push easy-going Americans too far," he said, "there won't be enough telegraph poles to take care of them." Address before

Governor Alfred E. Smith, Vice-President Woll of the A. F. of L., Raoul Desvernine of the Liberty League, were present, Smith and Woll making speeches. Father Curran said the meeting had the endorsement of Cardinal Hayes, Archbishop Curley of Baltimore and Bishop Ernest M. Stires of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Long Island and one of the first persons to endorse Mussolini, and Bishop Molloy of Brooklyn who is decorated with an Italian medal. With Al Smith and Matthew Woll as speakers, this meeting made the front page of the *New York Times* and received great publicity throughout the nation as "the opening gun of the great war against the Reds."

Even when all these reactionary activities are ridiculous, and when they fail, they do succeed in one thing: they continue to intimidate and terrorize public officials, editors, organizations. The fear of reactionary Catholic reactions stalks through the land. As a result, Catholics get abnormally large space and time in the press, movies, radio. There is fear of offending the Church and desire to propitiate it at all costs.

If a Roman Catholic priest and a Methodist preacher deliver identical sermons on some racy topic worth newspaper space—sex, morals, women's dress, anything with an erotic tinge—the betting is a hundred to one that the Catholic will get more space than the Protestant.

Newspapers do not give the Catholics space because their sermons are more newsworthy; they do so because they know that if they skip the Protestants (and Jews, Mohammedans, Christian Scientists and others) they will not be attacked, and will not be subject to pressure-group action, whereas failure to report the Catholics, or failure to give them good

Kings County American Legion convention; reported July 12, 1937, in the *New York Post*.

space, immediately brings a reaction which scares the circulation manager.

The Jews who own radio stations and the Jews who own motion-picture companies lean over backward to be fair to the Catholics. They actually give less time and place to their own coreligionists than gentile owners would give, because their democratic conscience tells them they will be accused of being international propagandists.

Before considering in detail the other important Catholic pressures, and the results they have achieved in politics, the press, and the fields of influencing public opinion, we may review in a general way the relationship of Catholic reactionaries with non-Catholic reactionaries.

CHAPTER 4

Catholics and Civil Liberties

ANNUALLY the American Civil Liberties Union takes a poll of its correspondents throughout the states as to which institutions or pressure groups are the worst enemies of liberty.

From its earliest days the American Legion has always ranked first or second. It will not be forgotten that immediately after its formation the Legion was most active in denying the right of free speech, free press and free assembly to individuals and organizations legally entitled to them whose views the Legion disapproved. One Legion group actually indulged in a lynching. Its usual activities, however, were to break up meetings of Liberals, radicals and labor unions and engage in strikebreaking everywhere. Nowadays, it should be added, the Legion engages in law breaking and violence infrequently, but it is still intolerant in its attitudes, still engages in Red-baiting, and can still be counted on to join any reactionary, semi-Fascistic movement. The "royal family" of the Legion, its rulers, frequently decide against the democratic wishes of the rank and file.

Usually the Chamber of Commerce alternates with the Legion for first and second places.

"The next two most active agencies of repression reported" in 1936, said the eighty-nine correspondents of the Union, "were the Daughters of the American Revolution and the Hearst press. Professional patriotic societies, assorted Red-

baiters, and the Klan, Law and Order Leagues and foreign-born Nazi and Italian Fascists brought up the rear."

There was one important change in 1937. The June report noted the increasing Red-baiting campaign throughout the nation, a very natural event, since in times of depression and unemployment and disillusion some minority must be made the scapegoat, and nothing is so easy as to pin the Red label on each and all persons and institutions with which one disagrees. The A. C. L. U. report again listed the American Legion as first offender, but second place was given by a vote of all correspondents to the Catholic Church, third to the chambers of commerce, fourth to the D. A. R., fifth to the Ku Klux Klan and Nazi agencies.

This was the first mention of the Catholic Church in the annual reports. There had been previous mention of certain Catholic organizations and groups in connection with gag laws, teachers' oaths, expulsion of liberal teachers from schools, but not enough to place Catholic activities in the list of repressive agencies. In the 1938 report there was no mention of the Catholic Church. Nor is the Church mentioned in various other reports on the status of civil liberty by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Methodist Federation for Social Service, etc.

The Catholic Church is not listed today in A. C. L. U. reports because its activities are usually classified as "pressure" and not illegal actions violating the civil liberties of others, but there is frequently great difficulty in drawing the line between the two.

THE RIGHT TO SPEAK

For instance, the matter of using public halls or public schools for meetings on subjects hateful to Catholics, such as democracy in Spain: When hall keepers in Jersey City

refused to rent out their buildings they said they feared Catholic reprisals. Their businesses would be hurt if they rented to anti-Francoists and they might be ruined financially. The pressure against them, we may therefore say, was unethical, vicious, etc., but not illegal. But what is to be said of the case where the hall keeper defied Catholic pressure and did agree to rent his place? The day after the announcement that a pro-Loyalist meeting would take place, the hall keeper received a visit from one of Mayor Hague's Jersey City policemen or detectives who used not pressure but threats. The law was violated, of course. But Mayor Hague is the law.

In scores of instances the pressure against Spanish pro-Loyalist priests touring America was vicious although legal, and in some instances illegal. It is illegal to threaten anyone with death, but that has been done to hotelkeepers where some of these priests have stopped. When Catholic organizations muster several thousand persons on the street to prevent a Spanish priest and Spanish patriots from speaking, it is violence and denial of liberty, and incidents of this nature have occurred.

For instance in Quebec, frequently referred to as a "clerical-Fascist" province, mob violence prevented the appearance of Spanish government representatives. The meeting had been sponsored by leading citizens of Montreal. The morning of the date set, the archbishop coadjutor of Montreal published in all the English and French newspapers a warning to all Catholics against Father Sarasola, alleging that his credentials were not in order. It was announced that local Catholic Fascist groups, French university students, and certain patriotic societies were planning a riot. That was on a Friday. Under pressure of Catholic students the chief of police was given the right by the city executive committee to ban the meeting and did so. On Sunday, Mon-

trepreneur celebrated the Feast of Christ the King. A hundred thousand French Catholics gathered in the Craig Street armories and the Champs de Mars. A crusade for the extermination of Communism was preached. Loyalist Spain was denounced as barbarous, and gratitude expressed to the Quebec and Montreal authorities for eradicating "all subversive propaganda and organizations." English speaking Catholics gathered in Loyola College where Rev. William X. Bryan, S.J., urged greater aggressiveness against Communism and those seeking to create sympathy for Spain.

In Quebec, Cardinal Villeneuve and M. Duplessis, prime minister of the province, addressed twenty thousand persons; the prime minister, after attacking Russia, said "The grand theories of liberty, of equality, of fraternity, are of no account (*ne valent rien*). Those which do count are the three theological virtues: faith, which illumines the intelligence, charity which enriches the heart, hope which brings comfort."

The Catholics, who control French Canada, won a victory all along the line. They held their own meetings, they upheld Fascist Spain, and they succeeded in having the civil authorities ban the meetings of another professedly devout Catholic, Father Sarasola, because he believed in democratic Spain. The whole week end (reported J. King Gordon) was Fascist in tone.

FRANCO'S ENEMIES SILENCED

Throughout the United States the lecture tours of Spanish Loyalist speakers, clerical and lay, were met not only with resistance but also with intimidation and threats from certain Catholic groups. While it was legal and ethical for Catholics to present their case for the Fascist Franco, their activities in many cities and towns resulted in all public halls being closed against the Loyalists and therefore a de

nial of the constitutional right of free speech and assembly through the use of pressure.

In Buffalo, New York, *The Catholic Union and Times* openly denounced the Spanish government as "socialist-communist-anarchist"; it did not state that the government was composed of a vast majority of democrats and republicans; it also denounced the Protestant preachers, Jewish rabbis, college professors, intellectuals and Liberals who sponsored a meeting for Father Sarasola. The *Buffalo Courier-Express* (December 11, 1936) made the following statement:

"*The Catholic Union & Times*, official weekly newspaper of the diocese of Buffalo, published every Thursday, carried a front page editorial yesterday condemning the Buffalo branch of the North America Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy as 'a disgrace to the city' and asserting that 'if a choice had to be made between Communism and Fascism, we will take Fascism every time.' . . . *The Catholic Union & Times* denounced him (Father Sarasola) as a 'renegade, an apostate, and a coward.' "

The newspaper then tells how Catholic intimidation caused the Eagles to cancel the lease of their hall to the relief committee if it insisted on the priest speaking. On the other hand the Catholics held numerous meetings where Republican Spain was the object of vituperation.

In Cincinnati Archbishop John McNicholas attacked the Rev. Dr. Jesse Halsey, a Presbyterian, raising the question, "Has the Presbyterian minister of Walnut Hills become a Communist?" because the minister had attended a meeting to aid the Spanish people. "It is a serious matter," continued the Catholic archbishop, "that the Y.M.C.A. of this community, the Federation of Protestant Churches and the

Interdenominational Ministers' Alliance should attempt to disturb the peace of this city by lending their support to a communistic government." According to the *Toledo Times* (January 12, 1937) the attack on the Protestant institutions was made in a "lengthy letter read in all churches of the Catholic archdiocese of Cincinnati by direction of the archbishop."

In St. Louis the *Catholic News*, attempting to prevent the use of the municipal auditorium for a Spanish meeting, made this statement: "Funds will be sought in Catholic St. Louis to provide bullets to massacre more Spanish priests and nuns." Since there is no law of libel against the use of falsehood in a case like this, the friends of Spain could take no action against such false and disgraceful statements. The same *Catholic News* insisted that the mayor refuse the use of the hall because half a million of the citizens of St. Louis "are Catholics. All of them recognize God and respect religion."

In Milwaukee a lawsuit resulted from the attempt by the Auditorium Board, of which William George Bruce, a leading Catholic, was chairman, to close its doors for a meeting at which Father O'Flanagan, an Irish priest noted for his part in the Republican movement, was the principal speaker. In White Plains, New York, the Reverends John D. McGowan, John B. Murphy and Thomas Cahill urged their congregations to protest the use of the County Center for a pro-Loyalist meeting at which Eugenio Imaz, a Catholic editor from Madrid, was the speaker. Superintendent A. Dana Calkins ruled that it would constitute "censorship of freedom of speech as accepted in America." The meeting was held. In Far Rockaway, Maris Stella Council, Knights of Columbus, succeeded in having Rabbi Mordecai Shuchatowitz cancel the use of a hall for a meeting in behalf of Friends of the Lincoln Battalion. A letter from William J.

Morris, Jr., Grand Knight, reveals that the protest was made by the Catholic Action Committee.¹ Catholic action is supposed to be the lay apostleship in the work of the Church.

In Rock Island, Illinois,² many leading citizens rented the ballroom of Harper House for a Spanish meeting. The radio station WHBF owned by the *Rock Island Argus* agreed to broadcast fifteen minutes of the speeches. But the Bishop of Peoria, numerous Catholic clergy, and the *Catholic Messenger* started a campaign against the meeting. The newspapers stopped publicity, the radio station canceled the broadcast, the hotel canceled its lease, the Ford Armstrong Hotel did likewise. The committee, headed by Arthur Wald, dean of Augustana College and Theological Seminary, then obtained use of the Labor Temple through its mortgage holder, the Rock Island Bank & Trust Co., but on the morning of the meeting the bank reneged. At the last hour an abandoned church, owned by a physician who did not like Catholic pressure, was obtained, but that night the police intervened, and although the chief later changed his mind, the Spanish delegation decided to leave Rock Island.

Commenting on repeated charges of "the increasing attacks of the Catholic hierarchy on the right of free speech for those who oppose or criticize their doctrines," William M. Callahan, managing editor of *The Catholic Worker*, replies that the representatives of the Rebels have also met with "determined opposition" of Loyalist sympathizers. He asks: "So what? Most Catholics happen to favor the Rebels. Have they not the right to plead their cause the same as Loyalist sympathizers? Does not the guarantee of free speech hold for the Bishop of Peoria as well as for the apologists of the Loyalist government?"

¹ *Brooklyn Tablet*, April 23, 1938.

² *New Republic*, November 16, 1938.

USE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The fact is that the issue grows more acute daily. The right of free speech is the right of all parties to be heard. But when Communists speak they are accused of being in principle opposed to the form of government under which they enjoy the right to speak, and when the Nazi Bund meets in New York, it is accused of representing a foreign antidemocratic government. The question arises whether a democracy, pledged to permit free speech, should extend that right to those minorities which would ban it to their rivals if they became the government. One way of dealing with this question has been an attempt to ban the discussions of all controversial matters in public.

A resolution to this effect, introduced in January 1939 at a meeting of the Board of Education of New York City by Colonel Walter Jeffreys Carlin, "to deny use of school buildings to any person or group of persons or organization whenever the object, purpose or intent is of a controversial nature liable to arouse ill feeling, jealousy or dissension or the use if granted will result in dissatisfaction and criticism or will be resented by a considerable number of the people of the city," caused one of the most disgraceful scenes in board history. Groups representing Catholic organizations, the "Christian Front," the "Flying Squadron of Americanism," patrioteers and bigots, started a commotion through which yells of "Communist" and "dirty Jews" were frequently heard and which prevented persons from speaking. When Dr. Holmes of the Community Church said that "some of the speakers here tonight are representatives of the Catholic Church," he was prevented from adding that he regarded that Church highly and feared the spread of anti-Catholicism. Mrs. Johanna M. Lindlof, who presided, was able to calm the mob. Dr. Holmes then declared such actions as the proposed

ban would "expose the Church to the kind of persecution it has faced in other lands." This caused another outburst of fury. The statement by a representative of a Jewish war veterans' organization that the Gallup Poll showed 47 per cent of American Catholics in favor of the Loyalists' cause resulted in an anti-Semitic uproar and threats of violence. Mrs. Lindlof expressed herself, next day, as shocked by the realization of the amount of intolerance in this country, by the failure of persons living in a democracy to realize that in a democracy one must permit the expression of opinions one considers distasteful. She deplored, especially, the anti-Semitic trend evidenced.

Among those who opposed the ban on free speech on controversial subjects were: Norman Thomas of the Socialist Party; Miss Helen Paul, president of the American Federation of Settlements; Dr. John Lovejoy Elliott, director of the Ethical Culture Schools; the New York City League of Women Voters, American Labor Party and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Among those who wanted the ban were Dr. William M. Ryan, who said he represented Fordham University alumnae, Xavier Labor School and other religious, civic and patriotic organizations; William A. Lynch of the Knights of Columbus; Dr. Alan McClean of the Xavier Labor Union.

TWO CASES OF PERSONAL LIBERTY

To the foregoing examples of negation of civil rights to public speakers must be added the attacks on the personal liberties of many individuals whose views are offensive to the reactionary Catholic minority. Throughout the United States, thousands of persons who have spoken for Loyalist Spain, collected money for ambulances, subscribed to medical aid, or otherwise activated their sympathy have been the

victims of Catholic reaction. Hollywood stars have been boycotted, threatened, attacked and even writers have found their personal liberty threatened by organized Catholics.

In New Canaan in the summer of 1938 Ursula Parrott, the popular novelist, agreed to lend her house for a party for Spain. A charge of one dollar entitled the holder of a ticket to a sandwich and a drink, and extra drinks were to be supplied at a fair price admitting a small profit for the medical bureau sending ambulances to the Loyalists. Mrs. Parrott was enthusiastic for this humanitarian work.

Then the Catholic pressure began. The editors of the leading popular magazines to which she sells her novels and stories were threatened with a boycott and with loss of advertising. George Bye, the literary agent, was panic stricken. He tried to persuade his client to call the party off. But Mrs. Parrott went through with it. At the last moment, however, police arrived who prevented drinks from being sold.

The case of another novelist, Bessie Breuer (author of "Memory of Love" and "The Daughter"), shows to what extent intolerance and intimidation will go. Miss Breuer (wife of the noted artist Henry Varnum Poor) sponsored a charity fiesta for the Spanish Babies Milk Fund, which had among its patronesses Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt, Representative Caroline O'Day, and the notable people of Rockland County, New York. But Catholic organizations did not favor milk for Loyalist babies. Mr. Arthur P. O'Leary raised the red flag, said it was a Communist affair. The press took up the matter. Physical violence was threatened the Spanish ambassador and general intimidation was reported in the New York papers. As a result all the leading people were aroused and made the fair a great success. Then, when the next elections came around the O'Leary group published half-page advertisements, a bitter appeal to DEFEAT CAROLINE O'DAY

because she had been sponsor for the iniquitous fiesta. Whereupon a counterblast was signed by Maxwell Anderson, Helen Hayes, Charles MacArthur, Ben Hecht, Carlton Balliett Jr. (an editor of *Time*), Mr. Poor and Miss Breuer and advertised everywhere. This was one instance in which the Catholic pressure group was defeated.

HOW VICTORIES ARE WON

It is my intention to devote an entire chapter later to the terrific Catholic pressure which has in some instances changed the policies of newspapers and in most cases perverted the reporting of the war in Spain. Here I will mention only the work of the Church organizations in a general way.

In July, 1938, Michael Williams reported that a bureau of information and publicity was being set up by bishops for spreading Catholic belief and teachings; it had been approved by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Bishop Gannon had said the purpose was to "get the Catholic printed word into the zone of 100,000,000 Americans." The function of the bureau also would be to counteract and correct the secular press in its misrepresentations of Catholic Church teachings; it would function like the Catholic Layman's Association of Georgia, but on a national scale; it would neutralize the attacks made on the Church due to misunderstandings and would result in the recognition by the press of Catholic Action.

The United Catholic Organizations Press Relations Committee, formed to present the Catholic point of view and "negotiate with newspapers and magazines in the Catholic interest, is described by Father John A. Toomey, S.J., in the Jesuit organ *America* (October 8, 1938). Its New York Chapter, embracing New Jersey, meets twice a week with

many professionals, doctors, lawyers, newspapermen, teachers, university professors present, and also housewives and others. Prayer opens the meeting. The minutes are read. Then come letters from many small towns in Texas, California, Ohio, for examples, asking for information on how to set up similar branches. Then come reports from members.

The following report is most interesting for the fact that it shows the activity of only one of the many subcommittees. Here are its eight accomplishments:

1. *The Daily Iowan*, publication of the University of Iowa, was denounced as "leftist" and generally condemned because it contained two articles, one on the Dies Committee, which the author disliked, and another on Loyalist Spain by a student who had fought there.

2. *The Michigan Daily*, of the University of Michigan, published an editorial on the Catholic Church and the Spanish War. Not liking this editorial, the committee brands it as "leftist" and makes the point that since Catholics are taxed and their money supports universities, the "leftists" should not be allowed to have control of publications and publish material listed in points 1 and 2.

3. Publications of the City College of New York were accused of attacking the Church until a Knights of Columbus member gathered together a number of students who complained to the authorities that as taxpayers they objected to articles published. It was agreed that units of the U. C. O. P. R. C. should be set up on or near the various college campuses to watch the college press.

4. A committee was formed for the purpose of discussing with New York movie officials the alleged growth of "left wing groups" in Hollywood. Although nothing was said in Father Toomey's article about this matter, it is presumably part of the pressure against scenario writers and the pro-

posed boycott of Hollywood stars who take an interest in political affairs and the Spanish problem.

5. The Institute for Propaganda Analysis was brought up for discussion. This new organization was established with a small sum left by the Boston philanthropist and department store man, E. A. Filene; its purpose is a scientific, academic—sometimes popular—but always impartial survey and investigation of the prevalence of propaganda. Naturally enough, those caught and exposed do not like it. A monthly magazine published by money sent by General Franco had the gall to use one of the Institute's declarations for propaganda purposes and was duly exposed. The Catholic committee objected to the September issue for the following short paragraph: "If Martin Dies had been a theologian in the Middle Ages, he should have felt at home. Anybody he didn't like he would have called a 'heretic' and that would have been that." As it was, Dies, of course, damns those he does not like by calling them "reds" and then proceeds to tear them to pieces. This first using the "smear word," followed by an attack on the victim, is one of the oldest and worst tricks of propaganda, the Institute has always maintained, and Dies was but the latest example. To the U. C. O. P. R. C. the word "heretic" apparently was objectionable; it referred to the item as exhibiting "spiteful bias," and it also said it was suspicious because left-wing propaganda exposés were missing. It asked Catholics to watch the institution everywhere for anti-Catholic bias. It gave no ground for such a suspicion.

6. Another sample of pressure is reported joyfully. The publishing house of Knopf had announced a new book by Freud. There were rumors that the great ex-Viennese and father of psychoanalysis would use his theory on the leading religions. To the committee this meant anti-Catholic bias. "I pointed out," says the report of the U. C. O. P. R. C. rep-

resentative, "that Catholics were extremely resentful at the flood of anti-Catholic bias which is finding its way into print, with apparently little or no effort on the part of those who control its publication to have writers adhere to truthful and reasonable presentation of their material . . . that it is extremely difficult to preach a doctrine of moderation and tolerance of our own people unless Catholics are accorded the same treatment of moderation and toleration by others; that under the circumstances the very frequent instances of anti-Catholic bias for which prominent Jews are responsible will seriously hamper all efforts to make our people believe that they can expect fair treatment from the Jews as a whole; that if such attacks by Jews continue it will inevitably produce extreme bitterness and create a fertile field for anti Semitic propaganda. . . ."

Here the threat is obvious, both of retaliation and anti-Semitism in general, unless a publisher—who has nothing to do with the views of his authors—does not change the findings of one of the greatest men of the world and of the century, or insists on publishing his scientific works uncensored. Moreover, the threats are made on mere hearsay and rumor.

The report claims that Mrs. Blanche Knopf replied the mss. had not been received by her, but when it arrived she would discuss its contents with the U. C. O. P. R. C.

7. Another committee reported its interviews with the editors of a magazine for men called *Mr.* It took objections to such sample items as "Movie Censor Joseph Breen—the Vatican's representative in Hollywood" and "Dumbest Remark of the Year: the Boston Catholic Bishop who said, 'I don't believe Franco would bomb women and children; he is too much of a gentleman.'" Moreover, "the issue glowed with a left-wingish hue." The committee is able to see pink at a hundred miles.

The publisher, in this case, said he was not responsible for the editors of his many magazines, but would send orders to the editor of *Mr.* for future use.

8. This was an attempt to influence the *New York Herald Tribune* and especially Irita Van Doren, editor of the section called *Books*. The Catholic pressure group attempted to dictate who should and who should not review books. It protested, first, the general reviewing of Catholic books, not having found them favorable enough. Then it protested Dr. John Haynes Holmes' review of Upton Sinclair's book, *Our Lady*, because in the committee's opinion this book is "anti-Christian." To this protest Mrs. Van Doren replied:

"If Upton Sinclair has written a story which seems to you insulting to the beliefs of many people, it is only fair to remind yourself, I think, that there are as many more who would not so consider it. Dr. Holmes reviewed the book in the spirit in which it was written and that, it seems to me, is all that we can ask for him."

This only infuriated the committee. It then sent a delegation to protest Mrs. Van Doren's views to the managing editor of the *Herald Tribune*. At the meeting here described the committee reported the meeting as "friendly" and promising a better treatment for the Catholic viewpoint in the future.

According to Father Toomey the function of the press relations committees "is not primarily one of protest or criticism, but rather one of education and enlightenment." But editors of the *New York Times*, *New York Post*, *Philadelphia Record*, *Time*, etc., who have had dealings with this press committee, have told me that they have not been aware of anything but threats and undue pressure and a desire on the part of the Catholic organization to monopolize

the press. In the eight cases cited, the committee, speaking for a minority of the people, attempted to edit the material intended for a population six times as large. The *New Republic* called this antidemocratic, the work of a "Catholic lunatic fringe."

DEFENSIVE ACTION OF 1920

But no one must deny that for generations Catholics got less than a fair deal in politics, the press, the schools, books, public offices, etc. They were not only a smaller minority than they are today, but they were also more on the defensive years ago than they are now.

The most important date of a change of attitude is September, 1920, when the hierarchy held a conference in Washington. The reports of the Administration Committee and departments of the National Catholic Welfare Council are illuminating.

In the report of the chairman of the Administrative Committee, the Most Reverend Edward J. Hanna, D.D., archbishop of San Francisco, it was stated that "we have directed the work with a view of its permanency: its development along the lines of Catholic work already accomplished; its ability and its fitness to voice Catholic claims; to defend Catholic rights and to infuse, so far as possible, Catholic standards and Catholic principles into our national life. . . .

"It must ever be borne in mind that non-Catholic and anti-Catholic organizations have offices and well-equipped staffs at Washington. . . . Unless they are met in their first stages by effective, nationwide opposition, the right of the Church will be imperiled and the well-being of her children endangered."

In the report by Most Rev. D. J. Dougherty, D.D., archbishop of Philadelphia, it is stated that "we have carried on no secret propaganda but have done all our work in the

open light of day. . . . There are powerful groups working secretly in Washington, already engaged in attempts to misrepresent the Catholic position." This was especially true as the Ku Klux Klan was then making its big bid for power.

In the second report of the administrative committee Archbishop Hanna said:

"The executive department . . . keeps in direct personal touch with the officials of the Government from the President and Cabinet members to members of Congress. It is a medium of communication, of information, and of action between these officials and departments of government on all matters that affect Catholic interests and Catholic rights. . . ."

PANORAMA OF CENSORSHIP

The work of censorship and suppression goes on everywhere. In every parish someone is watching and attacking. So long as local and national activities do not conflict with the rights and liberties of others to publish, speak, assemble, they are of course no concern of others. But there are also instances of unethical and extralegal pressure. At City College, New York, for example, in the student magazine there appeared a fiction story in which a character speaks disrespectfully of a convent. Whereupon the congregation of St. Patrick's Cathedral is asked not to sit idly by while "the flower of Catholic womanhood is debauched in the filthy minds of declared enemies of our faith"; and Communism is called the villain. Immediately afterward, Dean Moore not only bans the magazine in the School of Business, but also prohibits the sale and display of future issues.

No attention is paid to the fact that the story is fiction, does not express the editorial viewpoint of the editors, and that the character uttering the objectionable phrases may

not be the hero but perhaps the villain. The author, Jerome Weidman, whose novel had been withdrawn from circulation by Simon & Schuster because its (fiction) characters offended certain Jews, protested to Monsignor McCann at St. Patrick's against the "manifest misrepresentation" of his intentions, the misinterpretation of the story, the unfair criticism of the student body and faculty, and Professor Jarvis Keiley and Dean Gottschall of the College of Liberal Arts and Science defended the author.

Another example is the prepublication censorship which took place on the Bulletin of New York University's School of Commerce, in March 1939.

A sixteen-year-old boy (Donald Carroll) had murdered his eighteen-year-old sweetheart (Charlotte Matthiesen) who was about to have an illegitimate child. The editors used the tragedy for a plea for legitimate birth control and for the spread of sex education in the schools and colleges of the country. The editorial, "Pawns of Bigotry," was critical of the position of the Catholic Church on both problems. It said the tragedy was "a damning indictment of two of the world's most powerful groups—education and religion"; it criticized the attack on the Birth Control League made in the pulpit by (the late) Cardinal Hayes, and continued:

"We blame our ponderous educational system because of its sluggishness to adapt itself to modern conditions. . . .

"The Catholic Church . . . has been constantly active—but in a backward way. Bigoted and shortsighted in many respects, it has continued to erect barriers against constructive, intelligent measures and movements."

These views are open to argument, and Catholics deny them, but no one should deny the right of any press to publish them. Nevertheless the editorial was suppressed.

In Catholic countries, of course, such publication does not take place; in anticlerical countries, naturally, the Church

is attacked by unfair as well as fair means, and it is only in countries like the United States, England, and wherever democracy prevails that there is a conflict between the arm of censorship of the Church and the civil liberties of the public. In England, for example, Joseph McCabe, who was once a priest and who has fought the Catholic Church for decades, reports many ways by which the Church has retaliated.

At a certain time, he writes, "I signed the biggest and most profitable contract of my literary career, and, though the work had nothing whatever to do with any religion, the Catholic organization threatened to boycott the publishers throughout Great Britain, and I was compelled to retire with slight compensation. Booksellers are, to my knowledge, similarly bullied. Attempts have been made to get halls refused to me for lectures (not on Catholicism) by threats or a riot, and even my life has been threatened.

"It is under this heading of 'offensive to Catholics' that facts which the public ought to know are 'suppressed, and entirely false views of the Vatican and Church as an ecclesiastical corporation are maintained. Papers, books, libraries, even cinemas and broadcasting are used to give superficially impressive news about Catholic matters, but the moment some truth that would disturb the impression is mentioned, there are discreet, sometimes open, threats of injury to circulation or other mischief."

The pressure takes on various nuances. In addition to the raid on Mrs. Sanger's meeting, previously described, there were also raids on her birth-control clinics. In that of March 23, 1929, all her case records were taken by the police, and when the court ordered them returned, she found that 150 had been stolen. Mrs. Sanger noted that only those of Catholic women were missing. In the course of the ensuing weeks several of these Catholic women came to her to report

that each of them had received the same mysterious and threatening telephone calls from persons who evidently had seen their cards and insisted that they return to the Church and stop using birth-control methods.

The same sort of intimidation followed the speech by Father W. C. Kernan, rector of Bayonne's Trinity Episcopal Church, over station WEVD. Father Kernan, at the Free Speech Forum, answered Father Coughlin, giving the facts and truth about most of the falsehoods and forgeries and propaganda used by the Detroit priest.

No one could deny the truth of Father Kernan's exposé. No one tried to. But a Catholic barrage against WEVD began which lasted a week. The attackers demanded to know whether the radio station was Jewish; they charged Father Kernan with being a Communist although he attacked Communism in his talk; and some of them declared that Father Kernan had no right to the word "Father" because that was exclusively reserved for Roman Catholics.

At station WMCA there is a flood of Catholic protests over the so-called banning of Father Coughlin. The truth is, of course, that after the priest had been caught using falsehoods, forgeries, and anti-Semitic propaganda, the station very properly demanded a script, in advance, as it does of every speaker. Coughlin refused to deliver, and was stopped from speaking until such time as he does. But the Coughlinites (of whom many are bigoted Protestants) attacked without ascertaining the facts or employing intelligence. Here is one of their mimeographed letters:

The membership of the Christian Front have decided to exercise their influence with all Christians within the scope of their reach, toward the end that the campaign of anti-Christianity will be brought to an end at once. The latest

and most flagrant instance of such activity, which elevates the forces of Communism above Americanism and Christianity, is the unwarranted deprivation of the Constitutional right of free speech, that has been made by radio station WMCA in the City of New York against the Rev. Charles E. Coughlin. . . .

We are therefore determined to resort to . . . economic pressure. Inasmuch as radio stations exist by virtue of advertising, we are calling on you as a sponsor on Station WMCA to demand that the management withdraw its unfair restrictions. . . .

Will you be good enough to comply with this demand at once, and show the Christian Americans that they will have as much right to free speech as Communists have on the air waves of America.

Of this type of attack there are hundreds of instances.

What it all adds up to is a threat to the rights and liberties of others. So long as the rights and liberties of Catholics are infringed, it is logical and right for them to defend themselves, just as Protestants, Jews, Christian Scientists and Mormons have done and are now doing. But in cases too numerous to include in this book, defense has ended and attack begun.

In Massachusetts a "gradual process of restricting liberty" has been going on for many years. A Catholic censorship exists in all the arts and means of communication. Every year the legislature meets to consider more bills to gag, censor, suppress, and impose the viewpoint of what may now be a majority in Boston and other cities but not of the nation. The idea there is that patriotism, morality, good character and honesty can be legislated and that ignorance of what is wrong with the world will keep the people from vice and crime. All this legislation is reactionary, not a bit

of it is liberal or democratic. Most of it has the approval of the Boston "power house."³

In his open letter to Al Smith, Bruce Bliven noted some years ago the now obvious "Catholic Line" in politics. "We see members of the Church acting in local, national and international affairs, not as Americans but as Catholic Americans," he wrote. "We see the Catholic press supporting these policies with a unanimity and blind fervor that are disconcerting in the extreme. These activities go far beyond an attempt to say what devout Catholics should or should not do. They are an attempt to dictate what all Americans, whatever their faith or lack of it, should or should not do. . . .

" . . . It is a frightful mistake for the Catholic Church deliberately to embark upon a course that may bring forth the KKK sentiment again, and make it worse than before, by presenting it with legitimate grievances instead of the old, hysterical nonsense about 'rifles buried under the Catholic Church' and 'the steamer waiting to bring the Pope to Washington.' "

The "Catholic Line" Mr. Bliven finds everywhere: in control of the arts, quite complete, and applying to the entire population instead of only the Catholics; in censorship of plays, books, the movies; in "an attempt to apply it to everyone in voluntary parenthood."

Some of these lines or attitudes deserve much more space in this book. No one objects to them so long as they are directed in the name of truth and justice against wrong and intolerance, and no one questions the sincerity of those who take action. But there is still the question of objectivity. The pressure groups, and more especially the pressure group leaders, either are incapable of seeing or do not wish to see

* The term "power house" is applied by Republican and Democratic politicians to the residence of the highest Catholic Church dignitary in town. In New York it refers to the Madison Avenue offices of the cardinal.

that there are other groups and ideas in this world, and especially in America, which deny the ancient and present Catholic claim of a monopoly on Truth. Frequently the majority in America are convinced that just the opposite of what the Catholics consider the whole truth is the real truth. Unfortunately, it may be added, the majority sometimes acts in an indecent and vicious manner in forcing its views, just or unjust, on the minorities.

There is also a question, for non-Catholics as well as for Catholics, as to who creates and leads the pressure groups, and who really speaks for the Church. Is it the Pope, for example, who defends the Jews, or Father Coughlin who raves anti-Semitic falsehoods? The natural assumption is that the Pope speaks for the Church. Then how account for a Father Coughlin?

CHAPTER 5

Who Speaks for the Church?—Coughlin?

"The very enormity of a lie contributes to its success. . . . The masses of people easily succumb to it, as they cannot believe it possible that anyone should have the shameless audacity to invent such things. . . . Even if the clearest proof of its falsehood is forthcoming, something of the lie will nevertheless stick. . . ."—Hitler in "Mein Kampf" (unexpurgated editions).

Who speaks for American Catholics, Father Coughlin who has used a dozen forgeries and falsifications in his campaign against the Jews, or Alfred E. Smith who said to Coughlin, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor"?

Who speaks for the Church, Pope Pius XI, who asked General Franco to stop the murder of innocent women and children, or Father Bernard Grimley, editor of the London *Catholic Times*, who said of these massacres, that "women and children seem always to be getting in the way of the bombs of the other side"?

Does the Jesuit Father Thorning speak for American Catholics when he says,¹ in condoning the slaughter of a thousand civilians in Barcelona, that "every expert on war, whether a military officer or a college professor or a correspondent, admits that the day of the 'non-combatant' has vanished. This is regrettable, but it is a fact, frankly to be recognized by students of world affairs." One person who did not recognize the fact was Pope Pius XI.

¹ In a letter to this writer, the continuation of a newspaper controversy.

Does Noel Monks, a Catholic journalist, who saw German and Italian Fascists destroy Guernica and murder most of its inhabitants speak for Catholics or the priests who were not there and who deny the massacre? Or does Father Drinkwater speak for Catholics when he denounces Catholic editors because "they have for weeks sought to deny or whitewash the well-attested facts of the deliberate air-raid-massacre of civilians at Guernica, about which the only possible attitude for any civilized newspaper would be condemnation or regret"?

Does Cardinal Verdier speak for the Church when he tells the Paris diocese not to support Franco? Or the late Cardinal Hayes when he told the New York diocese to support Franco?

Does the Catholic journalist Edmond Taylor of the *Chicago Tribune*, who was with Franco, speak for Catholics when he describes the atrocities he saw Franco's Moors commit, or the Catholic journalist Patrick Scanlan of the *Brooklyn Tablet* who was not in Spain, when he denies Franco's atrocities but publishes the Hearst kind of atrocities against the Loyalists?

Does the priest who denounced Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia speak for his Church, or Cardinal Schuster of Milan, who blessed the murderous expedition?

Does Monsignor Ryan represent the Catholics of America when he speaks for the New Deal, or does a majority of the hierarchy when it opposes the New Deal?

Does *The Commonweal*, the organ of Catholic culture, speak for American Catholics, or *Social Justice*, the chief organ of hatred, Red-baiting and anti-Semitism?

This list of contrasts could be continued for great length. One obvious answer is that no one but the Pope speaks for the Catholic Church, and that although there is unity in faith and morals, there is freedom for all viewpoints in politics and material things. "We disagree on everything but the

Apostles' Creed," a bishop is reported to have said about a conference of prelates.

Unfortunately, the most raucous voice today is the voice of a Catholic priest preaching the reactionary anti-Semitic doctrines which cannot possibly be dissociated from Fascism. Father Coughlin of course does not speak *for* the Church. But he speaks to three or four million Catholics and as many non-Catholics. And what he says is typically Fascist—Fascist in its first stage, the stage of pseudoradicalism.

Who in America are the leading fighters against the finance system, the bankers? The Marxians and Coughlin. Who in Germany, who in Italy employed Marxian phrases and ideas to attack the financial setup in order to win the masses of people? Hitler and Mussolini. Hitler calls his party a Socialist party. Mussolini rewrote the Communist Manifesto, calling it the Fascist Proclamation. But the reactionaries were always in the pay of the bankers, the industrialists, the men of wealth and power who subsidized them for their own purpose, and their use of Marxian phrases was pure deception.

In hundreds of large and little ways the Fascist pattern in America copies that of European states. Red baiting, Jew baiting, labor baiting, intellectual baiting, are small parts of the general design, and so are superpatriotism, supernationalism, and the intense propaganda campaigns against finance, capital and big business, which falsely promise the people the same needed reliefs which liberal and progressive leaders promise them.

Huey Long was one of our leading reactionaries; the Reverends Gerald L. K. Smith and Gerald E. Winrod are typical of the emerging American Fascism, and Father Coughlin is the most successful. If he did not suffer from the same handicap, his religion, which also defeated Al Smith for the presi-

dency, Father Coughlin today would probably be on his white horse en route to the White House.

At the time the radio priest thundered against gold—and made a nice speculator's profit in silver—he was all for the New Deal, for labor, and against the money-changers, regardless of race or religion. He was equally opposed to Fascism and Communism. That he was a demagogue was obvious, but five years ago the traces of Fascism were apparent only to those who know its course.

In the 1938 issues of his weekly, *Social Justice*, Father Coughlin (after whose name appear the words "by permission of his Ecclesiastical Superior") showed himself to be the leading anti-Semite in America. He now outdoes the Silver Shirts, the American Vigilant Federation, and various Ku Kluxers in the republication or dissemination of the notorious forgeries called the *Protocols of Zion*; moreover, he is cynically aware that he is peddling falsehood, as his editorial remarks clearly indicate.

Let us examine one typical issue of *Social Justice*. In that of September 12—devoted to helping nominate John J. O'Connor—he prints *Protocols* Nos. 13 and 14, after attacking the radio chains for refusing to rent him time on the grounds that his oratory was controversial. In two columns, introduction to that week's portion of the *Protocols*, Father Coughlin attacks the radio owners as Jews, and furthermore accuses them of "doing little or nothing to militate against Communism, although they feed the people the propaganda of 'bread and circuses. . .'" The *Protocols* follow. On the very next page, reprinting an editorial from the *Observer*, official newspaper of the Rockford, Illinois, diocese, Father Coughlin says it "completely misunderstands the motives of Social Justice in exposing the reputed 'Protocols of Zion'" and actually prints the *Observer's* statement that the things are

"crazy forgeries." But the reason for republishing this editorial is that the Catholic organ also attacks Jewish leaders because many of their people sympathize with the Loyalist Spanish government. "We feel it our duty," says the *Observer*, "to expose again the forgery of the Protocols. We also feel it our duty to inform the mass of the Jewish people of the dangerous paths charted by their alleged leaders."

In reprinting the forgeries, knowing them to be forgeries, Coughlin uses vicious means to gain an end—and yet he would be the first to denounce as a fraud the century-old allegation that the Jesuits have as their guiding principle the idea that the end justifies the means. And there are, of course, scores of lies, frauds and forgeries intended to harm Catholicism which the Church has combated from the first written years of its history and which only Kluxers still use against it today.

Coughlin's anti-Semitism is like Mussolini's and Hitler's, an emotional part of a Red-baiting, antilabor, antiprogressive campaign. Thus, a large part of the weekly is devoted to attacking the C.I.O., in which, by the way, there are powerful progressive Catholic leaders and elements. Coughlin supports Homer Martin but calls C.I.O. a dictatorship; he claims that most newspapers are opposed to unionization because of "sad personal experience; as in the case of the radical-dominated Newspaper Guild—in too many cases organized by outright Communists. . . ." This is of course nonsense. Publishers have fought labor for a century. The Guild is not Communist-organized. But now we come to something more significant. "Will the Ford Motor Company ever be organized?" Father Coughlin asks, and answers: "Eventually. Craft members at the Ford plant, in many departments, are already members of the trade union for their craft. The irresponsible, not to say outright Communistic leadership, of the C.I.O. organization in the neighborhood of the Ford factory,

has, more than any antecedent attitude of the owners, prevented earlier negotiations. Mr. Ford has frequently stated his views that both management and labor unions were being controlled and exploited by the same alien and un-American interests. . . ." Coughlin predicts that if Martin cleans out more "Reds" the "union story at the huge Ford industry might become completely different."

This sort of talk sounds familiar. It parallels evidence in the La Follette Committee reports on the activities of priests and preachers in mill and factory towns whose churches were supported by corporation donations and whose sermons helped deceive labor as to its own interests.

A page in *Social Justice* is devoted to letters from readers. One gives thanks for supporting a pilgrimage to the Shrine of the Little Flower. Another informs Hitler that the Jews, four per cent of the Czechoslovakian population, control 70 per cent of its business. Our tariff arrangement with Czechoslovakia is explained "when it is disclosed that Cordell Hull is married into the international Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.—who have holdings in thousands of Czechoslovakian enterprises." The same writer calls the directors of the Bank of England "Rothschild tools." Another letter demands the arrest of Harry Bridges. And another complains about "early education about economics" which has "contaminated" the minds of Mrs. Baxter's adult friends in Iowa.

The featured article is by Edward Lodge Curran, Ph.D. It supports O'Connor and is the usual buncombe which attends the usual campaign between Democrat and Republican politicians. It is distinguished only by the fact that the author is president of the Catholic Truth Society—the man and organization which changed the attitude of a Brooklyn daily newspaper toward Loyalist Spain by the threat of canceling a \$20,000 contract.

But Father Coughlin adds a nuance to the usual Fascist pattern. It is in the form of a combination circulation stunt and intelligence quiz, and it is called, of all things, "the Christian Front Contest." Some of the questions are factual or innocent, others are a complete avowal of Fascism. Thus, the first asks, "Who first taught the doctrine of the Living Wage?" and permits the reader to choose between 1, Karl Marx; 2, Leo XIII; 3, Jesus Christ; 4, Pius XI . . . etc. But the fourth contest betrays Father Coughlin's fine Italian hand. "Of Fascism and Communism, why is Fascism the less of two evils?" he asks, and these are some of the reasons the contestant can check:

1. Fascism guarantees free elections.
2. Fascism recognizes private ownership of property.
6. Fascism permits free exercise of religion.

The tenth contest is called "Why is Communism anti-Christian?" and among the six reasons the reader can check are:

3. Communism is opposed to Fascism, which is completely Christian.
4. Christ was a Fascist.
12. Communism aims at abolition of private ownership of property.

In the twelfth test the question is "Why can Communism never be called Democracy?" and the first of the eight possible answers is: "Because its opposite, Fascism, is democratic."

It is of course true that the sample answers quoted here may be the wrong answers, according to Coughlin and his

judges, but no reader can miss the editorial bias in their wording. In test ten, answer 3, for example, the part "Communism is opposed to Fascism" is a fact, but the concluding part, that "Fascism is completely Christian" is purely an added editorial opinion, and pretty well gives Father Coughlin away.

"The Man of the Week" department on September 12th is not devoted to its usual personality, but to any union workman. He "wears overalls and a union button," begins the article; he has "a firm belief in the 'American way' of doing things";—he is idealistically described for five paragraphs, and then:

But this union man's peace of mind is being disturbed. His faith in unionism is being shattered by selfish labor leaders whose first thought is the accumulation of dues-dollars; whose thought for the welfare of the men they serve are only secondary. He sees labor's ranks split. He sees the undemocratic C.I.O. reaching for control over autonomous unions. And he can't down the feeling that "dictators" have no place in labor or politics.

All of Father Coughlin's published Red-baiting will occasion no surprise. Red-baiting has always been a symptom of approaching Fascism. Anti-Semitism is a still better sign, because all Fascists need scapegoats and there are no libel laws in America which protect races and religions from lies, forgeries, and demagoguery. The attempt to split labor by attacking the progressive elements worked well in Italy and Germany, and all pseudopatriotic Fascist organizations in America, as well as Coughlin, play that game here. There is almost no editorial difference between the Nazi weeklies and Coughlin's. *Social Justice* is saturated with class, religious and racial hatred and permeated with obscurantism.

FORGERY, FALSIFICATION, PLAGIARISM

Al Smith said² long before Coughlin began peddling the forgeries and quoting the falsifications: "When a man presumes to address so great a number of listeners as Father Coughlin reaches, particularly if he be a priest, he assumes the responsibility of not misleading them by false statements or poisoning their judgments with baseless slanders. From boyhood I was taught that a Catholic priest was under the divine injunction to 'teach all nations' the word of God. That includes the divine Commandment 'Thou shalt not bear false witness.'" Since that time Father Coughlin has been the bearer of false witness not once but dozens of times. And the Church, which, like most Churches, claims a monopoly of Truth, has not at any time checked or corrected its guilty representative.

The situation is more ironical because it so happens that many of the myths and forgeries upon which anti-Semitic campaigns have and are being unloosed were first exposed by Catholic priests. The Vatican archives are full of documents. Father Charles, member of the Jesuit faculty of theology of Louvain, has traced the notorious *Protocols* back to their origin. First of all there was the book *Dialogue aux Enfers entre Machiavel et Montesquieu* (Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu) written by Maurice Joly and published in Brussels in 1864. This book was merely a satire on Louis Napoleon, had no mention of the Jews, and was published a decade before the Zionist Congress convened in Basel and gave anti-Semites a pretext for yelling conspiracy.

The next item in this history of forgery was *The Jewish Cemetery in Prague*, by Herman Goedsche, a piece of fiction written under the nom de plume "Sir Charles Retcliffe." In 1872 a Russian version of this book was made for anti-Semitic

² *New York Times*, November 29, 1933.

purposes, but it was not until 1902 that the *Protocols* emerged. This forgery was signed "Nilus." Its original title was *Anti-Christ as a Near Possibility*, and it combined the original satire, changing the names of Machiavelli and Montesquieu to suit an anti-Semitic purpose, and the fantastic novel about the Prague cemetery.

In 1935 the forgeries were exposed at a trial in Berne, Switzerland. American anti-Semites claim that the decision of the court was reversed. This statement is in itself a falsification. It is true that the 1935 decision penalized the *Protocols* as *Schundliteratur*, which means pornographic, or smut-literature, and that on this technicality—there being no sex immorality in the *Protocols*—there was a reversal. But, as the Jesuit weekly *America* stated (April 30, 1938), the *Protocols* remained in the opinion of both tribunals an egregious forgery.

"*America*," that weekly adds, "took a positive stand on the *Protocols* many years ago, finding them to be an outrageous forgery, and an example of the worst sin against charity—an attack upon a group for its race or religion. The Review believes that Catholics, so often the victim of bigotry and hatred in the past and still wrathful over the Klan, the dark horror of the Smith campaign, the Black Legion, and the Nazi persecution, should be chary of giving the least credence to similar attacks similarly inspired, against the Jews. Moreover, this Review has no sympathy with the wolf-and-lamb argument of those who say: 'Maybe the *Protocols* were forgeries, but later events prove their charges true. . . .'"

But that is exactly Coughlin's position. In other words, *America*, a Catholic publication, takes a Christian attitude, and Father Coughlin, a Catholic priest, commits the worst sin against Christian charity. The liberal Catholic press, *The Commonweal*, *The Catholic Worker*, Cardinal Mundelein's *The New World*, denounce not only the forgeries but also

the use of the forgeries for any purpose whatsoever, but the entire Catholic hierarchy seems to be impotent when it comes to stopping one of its ordinary priests from the weekly dissemination of falsification.

Nor is this the only instance where Father Coughlin, speaking in the cause of Eternal Truth, falsifies the facts. He does so not one time but many times, and every time he makes one of his usual anti-Semitic orations—in which he quotes or rehashes Goebbels, Hitler, and Streicher—he has been caught plagiarizing or lying.

Here is a typical instance of another Coughlin trick: distortion:

Father Coughlin's
Radio Speech

November 20, 1938:

Moreover, I have before me a quotation from the periodical named *American Hebrew* of September 10, 1920, which says: "The achievement, the Russian - Jewish Revolution, destined to figure in history as the overshadowing result of the World War, was largely the outcome of Jewish thinking, of Jewish discontent, of Jewish effort to reconstruct."

The American Hebrew

September 10, 1920

(Contributed article; not an editorial)

"the annihilation of the most firmly entrenched, the most selfish and most reckless autocratic system in the world, the Russian Czarism.

"That achievement, destined to figure in history as the overshadowing result of the World War, was largely the outcome of Jewish thinking, of Jewish discontent, of Jewish effort to reconstruct.

If Father Coughlin had the paper before him, as he states, he was incapable of reading correctly, or he was mendacious. No such phrase as "Russian-Jewish Revolution" occurs in that article.

In his comment on this quotation Coughlin adds to the

phrase "the Jewish effort to reconstruct" the phrase "by means of Communism." This is a second falsification because the article refers clearly to the overthrow of Russian Czarism by the March 1917 revolution, not the overthrow of the Kerensky regime by the Bolshevik November Revolution.

But if Father Coughlin's quotations had been correct, instead of falsified, there would still be no ground for their use in anti-Semitic work because it was not an editorial from a Jewish publication; it was an article on "Jews in World Reconstruction" contributed by a non-Jew named Svetozar Tonjoroff.

Father Coughlin has also broadcast throughout the United States the old Nazi lie that Jewish bankers, notably American Jewish bankers, financed Communism in Russia. The idea itself is preposterous, as most bankers, Jewish, Gentile, Mohammedan or Shintoist, are of the Fascist mentality and equally opposed to the Marxian thesis. But the Nazis know the value of the preposterous lie. Father Coughlin said over the radio:

In our possession we have a copy of the official White Paper issued by the English War cabinet in 1919. This official paper prints the names of the Jewish bankers, Kuhn, Loeb & Company, of New York, among those who helped to finance the Russian Revolution and Communism. Since then both Jewish and Gentile financiers have been according financial comfort to the Soviet Republic. . . .

Again, a week later, Father Coughlin said:

The chief document, treating of the financing of the Russian Revolution, is the one drawn up by the American Secret Service.³ . . . Now, in Section 1 of this official report, we read:

³ Exposed as a fraud by Monsignor Ryan. See Chap. 2.

"It was found that the following persons as well as the banking house mentioned were engaged in this work of destruction: Jacob Schiff; Guggenheim; Max Breitung; Kuhn, Loeb & Company, of which the following are the directors: Jacob Schiff, Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff, S. H. Hanauer—all Jews." There is no doubt that the Russian Revolution, which broke out a year after the information given above had been received, was launched and fomented by distinctively Jewish influence.

When these statements were repudiated, Father Coughlin sprang what he thought was his ace of spades: Father Fahey of Blackrock Seminary, who gave as evidence paragraphs he claimed are in Section 8 of the British White Paper which Father Fahey on page 88 of his book identifies as "Russia, No. 1 (1919), A Collection of Reports on Bolshevism in Russia." This White Paper was published by H. M.'s Stationery office, London, and sold for nine pence. It can be obtained in any library. It contains nothing about the firm Kuhn, Loeb & Company, nothing about American Secret Service Report, nor does it contain the paragraph here quoted on the left, and compared to a Nazi propaganda sheet, on the right:

Fathers Coughlin and Fahey's
alleged British official
document.

If we bear in mind the fact that the Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. is in touch with the Westphalian Rhineland Syndicate, German-Jewish house, and with the Brothers Lazard, Jewish house in Paris, and also with the Jewish house of Gunzburg of

World-Service
Nazi propaganda sheet,
Erfurt, Germany, Feb. 15, '36.

VII. When we bear in mind that the Jewish firm Kuhn, Loeb & Co. is in contact with the "Rheinisch - Westfaelische Syndikat, a Jewish firm in Germany, with Lazare Bros., a Jewish banking concern in Paris and also with Gunzburg, a Jewish banking concern in St.

Petrograd, Tokio, and Paris—(etc.) it will be manifest that the Bolshevik movement is in a certain measure the expression of a general Jewish movement and that certain Jewish banking houses are interested in the organization of this movement.

Petersburg, Paris and Tokio . . . (etc.) it appears certain that the present Bolshevik movement is more or less the expression of a general Jewish movement, and that certain Jewish banking houses are active participants in the organization of the movement.

In the Nazi propaganda it is still St. Petersburg; in the version by both Catholic priests it is Petrograd, but in both versions there is no truth, as Monsignor Ryan, a Catholic of another type, has proved.

The probity and veracity of Father Coughlin were called into question a year before he began making these declarations by the banking house in question, which stated that "Kuhn, Loeb & Co. has never had any financial relations, or other relations, with any government in Russia, whether Czarist, Kerensky or Communist." The Kerensky government had received loans from the United States Government, and at that time Mr. Schiff offered to subscribe to a Russian Liberty Loan, but never did so. Felix Warburg at one time subscribed to the fund Herbert Hoover raised to save millions of Russians from famine. These are the only relations this banking house has had with Russia. A letter was sent to Father Coughlin following the first appearances of his charges in his magazine, "calling his attention to their falsity" but "Father Coughlin has, nevertheless, elected to disregard the facts and has repeated his misstatements."

Everyone knows that the devil can quote scripture for his purpose and men of evil minds can within the law tear phrases from their context, misquote, quote partially, and otherwise confuse the innocent. Here again Father Coughlin shines. In his December 4, 1938, broadcast, for instance, he

quotes the Sisson report, "documents whose authenticity is guaranteed by the National Board for Historical Service of the United States and accepted by the United States Congress as official." But the National Board for Historical Service is not a governmental organization; it was a private affair, and adding the words "of the United States" to its title is trickery. The so-called Sisson documents were exposed shortly after, being issued by the Committee on Public Information for propaganda purposes in 1918, as partly fraudulent and generally unreliable. In fact, the National Board for Historical Service reports on the documents which Coughlin quotes, Nos. 57 and 64, that neither it nor Sisson has seen the originals or even photographs, that Sisson rightly relegates them to an appendix "and expresses less confidence in their evidential value than in that of his main series" and that therefore the organization, unable to test their genuineness, "can make no confident declaration." And yet Coughlin can tell five million people that these items are of guaranteed authenticity and refuse to make a correction when the facts are laid before him. That too is Nazi propaganda technique.

Or, he can tear part of the Lansing telegram to the Kerensky Provisional government in Russia and make it appear as a telegram to the Lenin Communist government in Russia. The message of the American State Department to Miliukov, dated April 16, 1917, begins by stating that "American Jewry is alarmed by reports that certain elements are urging separate peace between Russia and Central powers. A separate peace may in our opinion, lead to the ultimate restoration of an autocratic government and the degradation of the Russian Jews below even their former deplorable conditions." The leading wealthy Jews of America were afraid of the Bolshevik movement. They were thankful the bloody Czar was deposed, but wanted the Kerensky regime to remain in power. In the concluding paragraphs of the telegram

signed by Marshall, Morgenthau, Schiff, Strauss and Rosenwald, it was stated that American Jewry was "ready for the greatest sacrifices in support of the present democratic government . . . ready to cooperate with their Russian-brethren in this great movement." Schiff was the only banker to sign. The others were leading businessmen, lawyers, philanthropists, all wealthy, all fearful of the Marxian movement. They were co-operating with Woodrow Wilson and the British Foreign Office in trying to head off Bolshevism by bolstering Kerensky. But Father Coughlin does not quote the first part of the telegram, and to his distorted mind the second part becomes evidence of Jewish international bankers helping "to plot revolution with its subsequent mass murder and practiced atheism." The Jewish leaders and one banker were doing exactly the opposite: they were trying to prevent the second revolution.

Everyone and every institution mentioned, from the Secret Service of the United States government to Kerensky, lecturing in the country, and Trotsky, exiled by Stalin and a refugee in Mexico, gave the lie direct to Father Coughlin. Evidence, documentary and unquestioned evidence, not falsifications and propaganda used by anti-Semites, was produced to discredit the Michigan priest, but he nevertheless refused to make an honorable retraction.

In July, 1936, addressing the Townsend Plan convention in Cleveland, Father Coughlin shouted: "That great betrayer and liar . . . Franklin Double-Cross Roosevelt." A week later he wrote "An open letter of apology to President Roosevelt" in which he said that he had used the word "liar," for which "I now offer to the President of the United States my sincere apology. . . . I shall strive always willing to admit my mistakes—including those of good judgment—and to apologize even publicly when confronted with them."

However, on September 25, 1936, Father Coughlin was

publicly rebuked by the archbishop of Cincinnati for calling Roosevelt "Anti-Christ" and a month later Coughlin referred to "the scab President Roosevelt," a phrase for which he again apologized over the radio. Immediately after the 1936 elections he announced he was withdrawing from radio activity "in the best interests of all the people." But he could not stay away. By the time he returned, the anti-Semitic campaigns of several pikers were being amalgamated into a big movement by the Nazi agents in America. Father Coughlin saw the straws in the wind. In 1938 he went entirely anti-Semitic. He utilized all the same materials which the Germans were using at home. But since the Nazis rule Germany, there is no means of showing the German people how the propaganda department is making use of the Hitlerian theory of the value of the tremendous lie. In America, on the other hand, the Bund is not in control of the channels of communication, and Father Coughlin was promptly exposed.

Cardinal Mundelein announced that the radio priest "is not authorized to speak for the Catholic Church, nor does he represent the doctrine or sentiments of the church." Alfred E. Smith, *The Commonweal*, George N. Shuster, Monsignor Ryan, Frank J. Hogan, head of the American Bar Association, deplored Father Coughlin's activity in spreading anti-Semitism.

On the other hand, Father Coughlin became the hero of the German-American Bund. Coughlinites and Bundites joined in picketing radio station WMCA which had insisted on two things: the usual ms. in advance, and the right to stop the spreaders of race and religious hatred. This station had just stopped Judge Rutherford because he was anti-Catholic.

The radio system is supposed to be truly impartial, much more so than the newspapers, which only to avoid a losing libel suit will print a complete retraction in the same spot

and with the same size headlines as the original protested story. Radio stations frequently have given the same time to answer to libels, and in the Coughlin case many believers in free speech felt that WMCA should permit the priest to speak—after submitting a ms. as others do—and immediately afterward permit a leading citizen to reply. But the station might not have been able to afford the free time. However, it was entirely within its rights.

All liberal Catholics were opposed to Coughlin. But the *Brooklyn Tablet* used the controversy to heighten the anti-Semitic movement. It approved Coughlin, blamed the Jews for the perfectly obvious statement made on WMCA that the priest's talks contained "misstatements calculated to incite religious and racial strife in America," and continued:

"The action of WMCA more than proves the contention that the vociferous Jewish leadership believes in free speech only when it pleads a cause with which they agree and is intolerant of free speech when it utters sentiments that are unpopular with them. . . ."

The radio station replied by making public a letter from the managing editor of the *Tablet*, Mr. Patrick Scanlan, referring to the speeches by Judge Rutherford of Jehovah's Witnesses, a sect especially abhorred by the Catholics. Scanlan had written:

"For the past two Sundays your excellent station permitted a Mr. Rutherford to broadcast his general tirade against the Christian churches. Mr. Rutherford belongs in the ranks of Franklin Ford and other bigots whose endeavors it seems to me is to misrepresent other religions and to spread bigotry. . . . You should either put an end to Mr. Rutherford's racket or else go over his manuscript before permitting him to speak."

The Holy Name Society of the Roman Catholic Church of Our Holy Redeemer, Freeport, Long Island, indorsed

Scanlan's stand. The Jersey City Council of the Knights of Columbus voted confidence and approval for the November broadcasts and protested the action of Station WMCA. The Committee for the Defense of American Constitutional Rights (which had previously never done a thing when civil liberties were infringed) sponsored a protest meeting and address by Judge Herbert A. O'Brien, of the Court of Domestic Relations, when all the pro-Fascists and pre-Fascists in New York gathered to cheer the priest. The call for a boycott of the station was made by Allen Zoll, leader of the American Patriots, and otherwise a Bundist. Other speakers were Scanlan and Borough President Harvey of Queens.

When the picketing began in December 1938, the leaders boasted that the majority of the 2,000 were Catholics, but there were also banners announcing the participation of the Protestant War Veterans and Protestant Chaplains Association. The Nazis did not announce themselves, but they were there in large numbers, carrying signs attacking Jews and chanting, "Do not patronize the Jews," "Don't forget to do your Christmas shopping at Christian stores," and "America for the Christians." Men with American Legion caps were present, as they have been at every Fascist event, from the lynching of Wesley Everitt in Centralia, Washington, to strikebreaking activities in every state in the union. John P. Cassidy of the Christian-American Citizens Committee Against Communism was a monitor.

The conservative weekly *Time* wrote a story about Coughlin and immediately received 500-odd letters defending the priest. Joseph Alexander of Johnstown, N. Y., asked his dealer "in the name of Christianity" to boycott the magazine; John F. Skelly of Brooklyn promised a boycott; James V. Shields of New York urged a boycott; a Boston reader was gathering 75,000 signatures to keep *Time* off the newsstands;

Stephen Bendick of Plymouth, Pa., wrote, "I spit on you and your kind."

Regime Fascista, the most unbridled of the Fascist propaganda papers, applauded Father Coughlin whom it called "an ardent admirer of Premier Mussolini," and *Zwölf-Uhr-Blatt* of Berlin led the Nazi press in Nazi hymns of praise for the Detroit priest.

Significantly enough, when the German Nazis held their first great mass meeting in America, in Madison Square, in February, 1939, the names of all democratic leaders, including the President of the United States, were hissed and booed, and the person who received the greatest ovation was Father Coughlin. Of the 20,000 persons gathered, it was estimated that there was an equal division between Nazis and Coughlinites.

The friendship, if not liaison, between the Coughlinites, the Bundists and the Hearst outfit has been noted in many cities, especially in New York, but Coughlin made it clear in his issue of *Social Justice* of May 22, 1939, which was a pro-Hearst, anti-Jewish number. The vendors not only sold the paper but they also shouted anti-Semitic slogans, and offered to fight. The present writer talked to one of the *Social Justice* agents at the corner of Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street, just opposite the Public Library. When it was pointed out that a near-by vendor was selling *The Catholic Worker*, which was attacking Coughlin, this Coughlinite, a man of 35 or 40, not a newsboy—said, "That crowd is Communist." "What about Al Smith's denunciation of Coughlin?" "Al Smith has been taken in by Communist agents. He's all right, but he has been fooled." "What about *The Commonwealth*? What about Monsignor Ryan?" "They're either Communists or Communist stooges." "How do you know?" "*Social Justice* says so."

In the summer of 1939 the Coughlinites in New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, and other cities began a little Storm Trooper campaign of terrorism. In a row between vendors of *Social Justice* and anti-Coughlin literature on 14th street, New York, a Jewish schoolteacher named Samuel Applebaum was stabbed. Salvatore Miglioni, alias Dominick Galacinto, was arrested. In Brooklyn, two passengers on a subway train, Joseph Quinn and Grant Martin, were arrested for beating a Jew named Hyman Mankas. At Grand Central Station Irving Berger was attacked and stabbed. The accused gave the names of William and Joseph Molloy. In a series of rows on midtown Broadway, started by followers of Father Coughlin who picketed Station WMCA, several persons were assaulted, including Lawrence Maynard, vendor of an anti-Coughlin pamphlet. John Dugan was arrested. In Jersey City, after Hague had lost to the Supreme Court and had to permit free speech, a meeting took place, marked by hooliganism on the part of the *Social Justice* agents and a thousand followers. The Coughlinites gave the Fascist salute. One of them, on being searched for concealed weapons, told a policeman: "I am a Coughlinite. I live in Jersey City and I have the right to break up a meeting if I want to." When William Callahan, of *The Catholic Worker*, one of the first fighters for civil liberty in Jersey City, began speaking, the Coughlinites shouted, "That's a Communist paper." At the end of the meeting the Coughlinites grabbed Edward Hunt, a Columbia University student, and threw him down the stairs of the subway. The daily press has published little or no news of the Coughlinite terrorism in many cities and towns, but *Social Justice* apparently is aware of it, for in its May 22nd issue it published a letter saying that "fighting, arguing or looking for trouble on the streets when selling *Social Justice* does not do our cause any good. . . . Too many well-meaning distributors take the law in their own hands—

at the drop of a hat. Let's try the easy way first, and then if New York must become the Barcelona of the United States, we will show those Reds how real Christians can fight."

Attendance at numerous Coughlinite meetings is predominantly Catholic, George Britt, editorial writer of the *New York World Telegram*, writes in *The Nation*, April 1, 1939. The anti-Semitic campaign is carried on by various organizations calling themselves "Christian Front," "Christian Crusaders," "American Patriots," etc., where the German-American Bund unite with the Coughlinites. "The Irish, thanks to Father Coughlin," concludes Mr. Britt, "have been enlisted by thousands as allies and instruments of Nazi anti-Jewish propaganda. Through the anti-Communist and pro-Franco trimmings supplied by Coughlin the campaign has won much useful help. Strong support is furnished by the Brooklyn diocesan weekly *The Tablet*, edited by Patrick F. Scanlan. . . . Coughlin is defended also by the influential anti-Communist publicist Father Edward Lodge Curran. . . . The Italians have fallen in line patriotically. . . . Italian Fascists and the Nazis fraternize."

The most amazing anti-Semitism on record is that published in the *Tablet* of March 25, 1939, when "A New York Priest" and Father I. Kozik of Don Bosco College, Newton, New Jersey, attempt to destroy Pope Pius XI's and other papal declarations against anti-Semitism; the first priest quibbles about the date of the quotation from the "*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*," and Father Kozik states that the Pope used the term "odium," which he translates as "hatred." He argues that Pius XI's ban on hatred of the Jews does not conflict with Coughlin and other Catholics indulging in anti-Semitism, since hatred is only one of several things which is meant by the term anti-Semitism.

These statements, of course, are both vicious propaganda and downright lies, because Pope Pius XI never quibbled on

the issue. He said openly, "It is not possible for Christians to take part in Anti-Semitism," thereby branding the Father Koziks of this country as unchristian despite their clerical robes.

Now let us look at the other side of the picture. What Catholic leaders and institutions are opposed to Coughlin and the Fascism he preaches?

Early in Father Coughlin's campaign of defamation, the Catholic Laymen's League Opposed to Political Ecclesiasticism, through its secretary, William R. Wallace, issued a statement accusing the priest of planning "to divide the Catholic Church into partisan political camps (which Coughlin's Ku Klux partners would agree is good strategy for those bent on the destruction of the Church)," and "to divide the nation into partisan religious camps (by which strategy the British crown has managed to rule numerous nations, even to this day)." When Coughlin "retired" from public life in 1936, he said the League attacked him "more viciously than has any Communist in America." The League resented the comparison and accused Coughlin and his "reactionary allies" of being "the chief fomenters of Communism by breeding the causes that foster it. . . . The real menace here to our country and our Church is not so much Communism but Ku Kluxism."

Catholic labor is generally anti-Coughlin. It accuses the priest of building his church with scab workmen and printing his magazine on scab presses. Moreover, there is a big Catholic element in the C.I.O., many of whose leaders are devout Catholics who recognize Coughlin as a leading enemy of their union. James B. Carey, national secretary of the C.I.O. and president of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, has publicly denounced Fascism, "the diatribe of Father Coughlin," Mayor Frank Hague and Fritz Kuhn, as equal dangers to American democracy.

The Catholic press is divided, but the Liberal minority is anti-Coughlin. Whereas *America* praised Coughlin's "sincere and eloquent championship of the poor man," and thought he "promulgated the words of the Popes on modern rights and duties," *The Catholic Worker* and *The Commonweal* have consistently opposed Coughlin. Commenting on Coughlin's radio controversy, the *Worker* criticized both the priest and his "pugnacious defense by Patrick Scanlan," adding it hoped that "the Jews of America will consider both cases not in the light of anti-Semitism but rather as two cases of extraordinarily bad manners"; it also denied the widely spread falsehood that Jewish leaders had not "spoken out in sympathy with persecuted and slain Catholics, but now cry out loudly for such expression on behalf of their own persecuted ones." It gives as documentary proof resolutions passed at a meeting of chief rabbis in France and America against treatment of Catholics in Mexico.

The Commonweal denounced "Coughlin's publication of the false and discredited Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion in that Hearstian adventure in journalism curiously named *Social Justice*," adding that "it isn't strange that these sworn enemies of 'political Catholicism' at this time brought him as a hero to the attention of a bewildered and sorely tried German people"; but it predicted the time would come when the Nazis instead of lionizing Coughlin would find him "invaluable to hold up as a villain to justify persecution of the German Catholic clergy. They can point him out, with the customary accent of Aryan virtue, in their reference to 'black priestcraft' of the Vatican. Father Coughlin, the Nazis know, may easily be presented as a priest, seeking, with no little energy, secular power of his own in political life." *The Commonweal* points to a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office condemning "that hatred which is now vulgarly known by the name of anti-Semitism," adding that

the "stuff" which Coughlin and "the incorrigible *Brooklyn Tablet* and certain other Catholic weeklies turn out on the subject of race, is anti-Semitism."

The most ambitious effort of Catholic churchmen and laymen to combat race hatred was begun in July, 1939, by the Committee of Catholics to Fight Anti-Semitism (of 55 West 42nd street, New York). The Committee includes the following notable persons: George Addes of the United Automobile Workers, Margaret Culkin Banning, Ade Bethune, Father Boland of the New York Labor Relations Board, John Brophy, Philip Burnham of *The Commonweal*, William Callahan, Dean Carey of Marquette, Jean Charlot, the artist; John B. Collins, editor of the *Pittsburgh Catholic*; John C. Cort, editor of the *Labor Leader*; Dorothy Day, Baroness Catherine de Hueck, August Derleth, George Donahue, editor of the *Labor Leader*; David C. Dunne, editor of the *St. Louis Catholic*; Father Gregory Feige, Father George Ford, Patrick Gorman, president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters; William Hard, John Hinkle of the *New York Times*, Emmett Lavery, the playwright; Rev. Daniel Lord of *Queens Work*, Rev. Joseph McSorley, Theodore Maynard, Rev. C. C. Miltner of Notre Dame, Edward J. Moloney, Catholic student leader; Philip Murray of the C.I.O., Ruth O'Keefe, Martin Quigley, Monsignor Ryan, Edward Skillin, Jr., of *The Commonweal*, Harry Sylvester, Gene Tunney, Robert F. Wagner, Jr. (son of Senator Wagner, a Methodist); Professor Daniel Walsh.

In the Committee's magazine, *The Voice*, the headline of the first issue is "CATHOLICS ANSWER 'SOCIAL JUSTICE' LIES." On the front page, under the second headline, "Bishops condemn anti-Semitism," appears the picture of Archbishop Mooney of Detroit, Coughlin's superior, who attended a meeting of the American bishops which denounced anti-Semitism. However, it is Archbishop Mooney who is still

Coughlin's superior and therefore completely responsible for the anti-Semite's actions and utterances.

Other notable Catholics who have joined the fight on anti-Semitism quoted in *The Voice*, are Don Ameche, Irene Dunn, Bryan Foy of Warner Brothers, Heywood Broun, a recent convert; Joseph I. Breen of the movie-production code, John W. Considine, Jr., and James K. McGuinness of M. G. M. pictures.

Another leading anti-Coughlinite is Westbrook Pegler who once attended a Jesuit school. Pegler writes that Coughlin is as reckless as Huey Long, and worse, because he employs "not only the standard gags of the lay demagogue, but a hysterical manner and the dangerous element of religious passion and bigotry. In the cloth of a priest and identified by his own bishop as the voice of God, he noisily insulted the head of the American government, organized a political group on Fascist lines which challenged American liberties, and spoke of a resort to bullets instead of ballots in an address which referred to our President as an anti-God. To the inflamed ignorance of some poor, dumb followers this might have been interpreted as a command from God Himself to take down the old musket and let fly at the President of the United States at some public appearance."

Finally Mr. Pegler brings up the most important question about Coughlin, the question of responsibility for his activities. The columnist believes that "in this case the Detroit diocese has made itself a party to Coughlin's campaign. Certainly the diocese has not dissociated itself from his activities. . . . I think in years to come Coughlin's conduct in this campaign is going to cause difficulty for Catholics because the Church has not formally repudiated this man's bid for personal power as a cleric. . . . Coughlin will be duck soup for the anti-Catholics ten years from now or whenever the next (anti-Catholic) wave rises and, unfortunately, no Catholic

will be able to explain that he was speaking only for himself, since his bishop said that Coughlin's voice was the voice of God.⁴ . . . Coughlin is not alone in this. The diocese has a responsibility as great as its privileges and deserves no immunities which it does not grant to its opponents."

It is the contention of Father Coughlin's adherents that only his superior, the late Bishop Gallagher and the present Archbishop Mooney, can stop the priest. Neither Cardinal Mundelein nor Cardinal O'Connell, the two most noted antagonists, the latter conservative, the former liberal, have been able to do so. So far as canon law is concerned, there are conflicting opinions. The Rev. Edward V. Dargin, J.C.D., wrote in the *Ecclesiastical Review* that Coughlin's claim he has to enter politics just as a doctor, lawyer or other citizen should, is fallacious. "Father Coughlin's freedom has been limited directly and expressed not by civil law it is true, but by canon law. . . . The basis of these express limitations of the right of clerics to mix in matters of themselves good is that, despite their goodness and praiseworthiness in a layman, they are not becoming the dignity and mission of the priesthood."

Coughlin's claim he is carrying out encyclical ideas, the priest also denies, adding that "documents on Catholic action stress the fact that it is distinct from political action"; he quotes Canon 139 and learned ancient and modern authorities. "The activities of Father Coughlin," he concludes, "constitute violations direct of existing canon law."

But the Right Rev. Monsignor William F. Murphy of

⁴"When the Rex brought bishop and priest to shore, Bishop Gallagher cried to a crowd on the dock: 'Father Coughlin is an outstanding churchman and his voice . . . is the voice of God.'" *Time*, Sept. 14, '36.

"When he (Father Coughlin) presents Christ's moral solution of social problems, as expounded by the Popes, his voice is the voice of God." Bishop Gallagher's statement as reported by Anthony J. Beck, editor, *The Michigan Catholic*.

Detroit is of the opposite opinion and quotes numerous authorities under the following headings:

1. Code of Canon Law Contains no such Prohibition.
2. No Papal Instruction Forbids Political Activities to Clerics.
3. No decree of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore actually in force forbids political activities to clerics.

Under the first heading Monsignor Murphy remarks that the instruction which Pope Benedict XV sent to Cardinal Czernack of Hungary was an admonition to the clergy not to become involved in politics "in a way to turn the faithful against the sacred ministry, nor discuss matters which were not within their competency." Numerous papal letters are interpreted by the Monsignor in exactly an opposite sense from that of Father Dargin. The letter of Pius XI to the Mexican clergy, says the former, tells them to refrain from attaching themselves to any political action, or to form a political party, but "though the clergy are not to be partisan, there is open to them a vast field wherein they may give attention to religion, morals, education and social economy. . . . Certainly nothing in these letters causes us to conclude that political action is denied to the clergy."

In the last Coughlin phase, anti-Semitism in his weekly *Social Justice*, and over the radio, the priest apparently has the "permission" and not the "approval" of his bishop. When Leo Fitzpatrick, manager of Station WJR in Detroit, said he permitted Coughlin to speak because the priest "had the approval of the archbishop," Archbishop Mooney settled that question neatly, by saying:

"The fact is that Catholic Church authorities in passing on writings or utterances submitted for preview, make a clear distinction between permission and approval. The per-

mission of church authorities to publish an article or broadcast an address does not imply approval of the contents of that article or address, much less does it make the article or address an authoritative statement of the Catholic position on the subject treated."

The Church can take action whenever it so desires. It is a fact that a Swiss Catholic professor was silenced by the Church because he lectured in favor of pacifism. It is a fact that every Catholic priest who has come to America pleading for the Spanish Loyalists has been "unfrocked" by the Catholic hierarchy or press, notably Fathers Lobo, Sarasola and O'Flanagan, whereas every priest who defended Franco, even to apologizing for the murder of civilians, or using falsehood, has not been censured. It is a fact that liberal Catholic priests who were anti-Franco were stopped from saying so. It is a fact that a French anti-Franco publication was suspended. It is a fact that a priest named Trzeciak was divested of his robes by the Polish hierarchy when he failed to defend a charge he made libelous statements against the Jews.

But, "the church cannot 'stretch forth a restraining hand' by the very nature of its constitution," replied an apologist for its stand on Coughlin. "The only way in which Father Coughlin can be silenced by the Church would be for the American Hierarchy to appeal to Rome for the Pope to override the bishops' decision. This is an extraordinary measure. . . ."

So Coughlin continues to appear on the radio and in his magazine "by permission of his Ecclesiastical Superior." He has the permission to lead an anti-Semitic movement, to tell lies to millions of people, to publish the most malicious propaganda—but not the "approval" of the Church.

Let us accept all the explanations. Coughlin does not speak for the Church. He expresses only his own views. He has been rebuked by the Vatican and his bishops every time

he went too wild. And all that. The fact still remains that Coughlin is today not only the leading anti-Semite in America but also the leading Fascist in America, and the Church does nothing about it. It is true that millions of Catholics oppose his views, that every Catholic intellectual and liberal is against him and a large part of the conservative as well as all the liberal Catholic press, but these facts only serve further to emphasize the thesis of this book, that there is a crisis in the Church, and that it too faces the question of democracy versus Fascism.

PART II

CATHOLIC ACTIONS—AND REACTIONS

CHAPTER 6

Catholic Pressure in Politics

DOES the Catholic Church, the hierarchy or its lay organizations indulge or "meddle" in politics in the United States or the rest of the world?

Two answers can be found in Catholic writings: yes and no. A close friend of Cardinal Pacelli (now Pope Pius XII) declared that "when non-Catholics tell you that the Pope is all-powerful with priests and laity alike, it would be as well to remember that encyclical forbidding priests to have political ideas, and then to look around at Ireland, Germany, Austria, and Spain, and in fact the whole world, and realize how little that command is being obeyed."¹

A writer in the Jesuit organ *America* deplores what he believes is a fact that Catholics do not act in unison, that they live their political life in a "slough of indifference" which makes them politically impotent; he asks that Catholics "weigh in the balance the possible and probable reactions and decisions of one man or another in office, towards questions which affect me as a Catholic or which affect doctrines in which as a Catholic I must believe."²

On the other hand, *The Sign* (March 1938) says, "it is our duty to block legislation which strikes at the welfare of the nation and at Christianity itself," this particular editorial being in reference to birth control.

¹ Teeling, *The Pope in Politics*.

² *America*, Sept. 12, 1936.

Harnack, the great Catholic authority, says in his *What Is Christianity?* that "it is an empire that this priestly Caesar rules, it is just as essential to this Church to exercise governmental power as to proclaim the Gospel," and a later-day apologist, Belloc, declares⁸ that the Catholic Church, when ever it becomes powerful, must try to win recognition as the absolute authority in relevant matters; Mr. Belloc refuses to consider the Catholic Church as a sect, as a part of Christianity; for him as for all Catholics, it is *the* Church, the only receptacle and conveyor of the everlasting Truth, and therefore entitled to overwhelming power.

"Politics," said Cardinal Manning, "are a part of morals."

William Howard Taft, when governor of the Philippines, made it clear to Pope Leo XIII that the separation of Church and State in the islands was an established fact; he recognized that in the past there had been "the closest association in property, religion and politics."

When it comes to Latin America and Europe, the evidence, of course, is plain of the part the Church, its priests and its various organizations, play in politics. In our own time several nations have been governed by Catholic priests, or Catholic parties, and Catholic prelates have made a political instrument of their church. Monsignor Seipel of Austria was one of the most noted of these men. The present Portuguese government is another example of the Church in politics. And here is a little human interest story which also serves as evidence:

In the island of Malta, an important military base and therefore a bone of contention between Britain and Italy, a Franciscan friar was ordered by his church superiors back to the latter country. He was Maltese born, pro-British, and feared Mussolini's egotistic small revenge which has for a score of years searched out the mildest of the Duce's critics.

⁸ *Catholic World*, September 1924.

The governor of Malta, Lord Strickland, was also a Catholic, and the monk arranged with him for an official refusal of a passport to travel anywhere.

When this news was heard at the Vatican, the diplomatic demand for the recall of Lord Strickland followed; and when the British government refused the request, the clergy of the island went into power politics, with the result that peace and law and order were seriously jeopardized. During the elections of 1930 the hierarchy declared it a mortal sin—roasting in hell-fire—for the members of their congregations to vote for the Strickland party. Moreover, Lord Strickland said afterward that he learned that the priests compelled all Catholics to tell them in the confessional for whom they had voted.

In the plebiscite held in Austria to confirm the rule of Adolf Hitler, "reports from all parts of the country indicate that the Catholic clergy actively took part in the plebiscite campaign, counseling the faithful to vote 'Yes.' Jesuit fathers at Feldkirch in Vorarlberg unanimously voted 'Yes,' demonstratively refusing to enter booths to cast secret ballots."⁴ Were they terrorized? Reports indicate they were not. But they sold their country down the river just the same—and to the man who at the very moment was persecuting the Catholic Church of Germany because it meddled in politics.

Pope Pius XI denied this. Addressing the Sacred College of Cardinals, Christmas, 1937, he denounced Hitler's persecution "attended by brutality and violence, traps and deceptions of fraud and falsehood." The Pontiff took great pains "to deny charges of meddling in politics leveled at Catholicism in Germany as a pretext for attacks on the Church. The same charge, he reminded his audience, was brought against Christ."

⁴ The full story of Austrian Catholic political meddling is told in M. W. Fodor's *Plot and Counterplot in Central Europe*.

"Some people affirm," said the Pope, "that the Catholic religion is no longer the Catholic religion, but that it is politics and concerns itself not with religion but with politics. Certainly we tell every citizen that his civil rights must conform to the laws of God. That is what we have done and what we have always done. Any one who thinks or says otherwise is truly against truth.

"We wish to repeat and loudly protest before all the world: We are not engaged in politics. . . . Religion is our only care and that we wish it to be our only care.

"Admittedly we affirm that every citizen must obey the laws of God, the laws of Christ, in his civil life. But is this politics, or is this religion? It is most certainly not politics."

But in Belgium, in a dispute over the expulsion of Nazi agents who were active in the annexed provinces of Eupen and Malmedy, Joseph Ernst Cardinal van Roey's letter urging electors to vote a certain way caused great excitement throughout the country and many worshipers to walk out of the churches in the two provinces. In France, according to the *London Tablet* (January 21, 1938, p. 94), "a network of societies" in the diocese of Nancy and Toul was "another example of the disciplined energy of the Catholics. . . . The bishop, Mgr. Celle, has succeeded in welding together a very powerful organization. . . . Already 50,000 out of 120,000 electors belong to these Catholic societies. . . . This large body of voters, who constitute a majority of the electorate, will have something to say to the seven deputies to be returned to the new parliament."

The number of examples of Church and clergy either directing or meddling in politics in Europe, South America and distant lands can be repeated by the hundred. In the United States there is not only separation of Church and state but actually less hidden interference in politics by the Methodist, Catholic, Jewish or other churches; but to say

that the churches stay out of politics is to confess one's complete naïveté. Have we forgotten the Eighteenth Amendment? More will be said on the subject of the Catholic Church in European and Latin American politics in other chapters. The examples which are given in the following pages deal with American affairs.

THE ELDER LINDBERGH

A great and good man named Charles A. Lindbergh—not the flier but his intelligent father—made three powerful enemies during his services to the nation in Congress: the money interests, the press, and the Catholic Church. Any one of them was strong enough to defeat him; the combination of the three was fatal.

Lindbergh fought the bankers and war-makers. He wrote a book against the "Money Trust." He exposed the American Newspaper Publishers Association—the Lords of the Press—when they engaged in one of the most hypocritical actions in American history: lobbying for a change in the Canadian reciprocity tariff measures which would make wood pulp and news-print paper free of duty while imposing duties on other things "to protect American industry." And, finally, Congressman Lindbergh called for a Congressional investigation of certain charges brought by various organizations against the Catholic Church in America. The purpose here was to determine once and for all whether or not these charges were justified. Said Mr. Lindbergh: ⁵

"I realize full well that prejudice is the enemy of good government and defeats the exercise of the rights of the people.

"I served notice upon the associations making charges against the high dignitaries in the Roman Catholic Church

⁵ *The Lindberghs*, by Lynn and Dora B. Haines.

of their selfish interference with government that I would introduce a resolution for an investigation of the charges, so that the issue might be determined.

"I am sure that it is for the interest of everybody, including Catholics who believe in keeping Church and State separate, to have the facts, whatever they are, cleared up, so the people may not be misled."

Mr. Lindbergh wanted the truth. He was not an anti-Catholic. In fact, he was a friend of all liberal Catholics and asked their support in having his proposed investigation go through, so that the poisoned air might be cleared and the threat of what soon afterward became the new Ku Klux Klan killed in infancy. On July 13, 1916, Lindbergh introduced House Joint Resolution 264 (64th Congress, 1st Session) which embodied pretty fairly the whispers, suspicions and fears of many people, not only the prejudiced and the bigoted, but the well-intentioned and the searchers for truth. Twelve years later, when the Ku Klux had spent its poison, the same questions still dominated the campaign of Alfred E. Smith for the presidency, again reviving prejudice, just as prejudice is being revived again today. If an honest impartial investigation had been made in 1916, perhaps much of the later bigotry and viciousness might have been avoided.

"As I recall the incident," James Manahan, one-time colleague of Lindbergh in Congress, said sometime later, "Congressman Lindbergh's resolution was for the purpose of investigating the Catholic Church, and the organization and motives of her accusers. When, as a Catholic and as an old friend of his, I questioned him on the matter, he earnestly protested that he knew very well that the Catholic Church had nothing to fear from any sort of investigation and that he believed that the bigoted anti-Catholic organizations were in bad faith and that a thorough investigation would reveal their stupidity and intolerance. Of course, I knew, as all the

men intimately acquainted with Mr. Lindbergh knew, that he was absolutely devoid of any sort of religious prejudice. Nevertheless, the resolution was seized upon by his political enemies to create prejudice against him in the minds of Catholics who were easily misled on the sensitive subject of their religion. The resolution was a political blunder which no one but an artless and innocent man like Lindbergh would make."

And Lynn and Dora Haines testify, in *The Lindberghs*, that nothing more surely brought about Lindbergh's political defeat than the counterattack which Catholics made against this resolution. It was the Church which did more than the bankers and the reactionary press to kill Mr. Lindbergh's political career.

INTIMIDATION OF CONGRESSMEN

The case of Congressman Jerry J. O'Connell, Catholic, twenty-two years later, illustrates *inter alia* the tremendous increase of power of the Catholic Church in American politics.

If there are any persons in America who still believe that the Church in this country is not interested in politics, differing from its branches in many other countries where (until a change in international policy led to their abolition) numerous Catholic political parties, so designated and named, flourished with the approval and leadership of priests and cardinals—then he should investigate the case of the Spanish embargo, the case of American congressional greetings to the Spanish Congress, and all matters pertaining to the Spanish War.

When the Knights of Columbus enter into the embargo question, it is merely a matter of private pressure; but when priests and bishops instruct their congregations to attend

meetings, write telegrams, see their representatives, and engage in political pressure methods nationally and locally, then evidently the Roman Catholic Church has entered the political field. (But where faith and morals leave off nowadays and politics begin is another matter.) Here, for one example of many, is the part Archbishop Curley of Baltimore played: ⁶

CATHOLICS OF WASHINGTON

ATTEND THIS MEETING

Archbishop's House
408 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Md.

January 3, 1939

To the Priests and People of Washington and Vicinity

Dearly Beloved:

Announcement shall be made by reading this letter to all the Masses on Sunday, January 8, of a Mass Meeting to be held tomorrow, Monday, January 9, at Constitution Hall, . . . in the interest of preserving the Spanish Embargo.

During this week a Joint Committee consisting of representatives of various Communist United Front Organizations is holding a rally in Washington to emphasize what they have called 'Lift the Embargo Week.' . . . I very earnestly urge our people to join with those of other Faiths and take part in this demonstration tomorrow evening. At a time like this, we must, in the interest of all that is right and decent, make our voices heard by those who have the responsibility of shaping the nation's policy. We should make emphatic protest against any endeavor to lift the present Spanish embargo.

Begging God's blessing upon you, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

Michael J. Curley

Abp. of Baltimore

Archbishop Curley, raising the Red propaganda flag over

⁶ *The Catholic News*, January 6, 1939.

the Spanish Republican meeting, was also departing from the facts. The Loyalist meeting was held by the representatives of 274 national and local organizations, including social workers who sent a delegation including Dr. John A. Kingsbury, Helen Hall of the Henry Street Settlement, Paul Kellogg and Mary van Kleeck to the White House. Another deputation headed by Dr. O. A. Maurer, moderator of the General Council of Congregational Churches, and including Ernest Sutherland Bates, Rockwell Kent, Paul H. Todd, also called at the White House. Among the speakers were Leon Henderson of the National Economic Committee, Louis Bromfield, the noted author who in defiance of the Fascist tendencies of the American colony in Paris became the head of pro-Loyalist groups there; Representatives Bernard and O'Connell (Catholics). Four American Catholic veterans of the Lincoln Brigade, Fred Keller of Boonton, N. J.; Sergeant Joe Kelly of Newark, Sergeant Ed Flaherty and Private Joe Brennan of Philadelphia, attended the Catholic mass meeting to deny the statement made there that the pro-Loyalist groups were Communist. When the Spanish ambassador, Fernando de los Rios, invited noted Francoists to visit Spain, Archbishop Curley replied by calling the ambassador a "common, ordinary liar."

The embargo resolution was passed by a hysterical Congress which was for peace at any price—including stupidity. It was a godsend to Franco, Hitler, Mussolini and the American Fascists. American democrats were overwhelmingly for Loyalist Spain, and only a little over a third the Catholic population for Franco. Against keeping the embargo were many leading citizens such as Henry L. Stimson, no radical, who wrote on the legal aspects of the question; Senators Borah, Nye, Pope, Thomas, Pittman, some for legal reasons, others because they believed in the triumph of democratic ideas and wanted to save Spain from degenerating reaction;

the columnists Walter Lippmann and Dorothy Thompson of the Tory *Herald Tribune*; Raymond L. Buell and Carrie Chapman Catt.

On May 5, 1938, the *New York Times* "printed its sensational story that repeal was assured, and that the State Department had given its nihil obstat," Prof. Max Lerner reported in *The Nation* shortly thereafter. "There was no doubt that the story was true. But when it appeared, the Catholics got busy and reached the President, who was fishing in Southern waters. High church dignitaries came to Washington and talked cold politics. Administration sources of whom I have inquired have denied the report that Cardinal Mundelein of Chicago interceded with the President through Mr. Farley. Yet the report will not down; and Mundelein, as the prize New Deal cardinal, would be the strategic link between Catholic reaction and New Deal realism. Along with the Catholics, the British Foreign Office and its satellites among the major American ambassadors in Western Europe got busy. Mr. Roosevelt came back, his leaning toward repeal vanished. So also was Mr. (Secretary) Hull's and that of the minor Hulls. . . . Only a band of heroes could have withstood the combined effect of Catholic votes, State Department learning and authority, Administration pressure, and mental sluggishness—and the Senate committee was not heroic. . . .

"In addition to the British lion, there is the Catholic vote. The biggest factor within the State Department was British pressure, but the biggest factor in the mind of the President was the Catholic vote. Mr. Hull has said some indignant things about organized pressure from the left. Will he deny that the greater part of the congratulations he has received on his stand come from Catholics? If this is a fact, he can scarcely feel elated over it. The *Washington Times* had the courage to write, 'It is a cold political fact that the Catholic

Church has taken a determined stand in favor of General Franco.' There are more than twenty million Catholics in this country. On the issue of the Spanish struggle, as on other issues, their Hierarchy is now presuming to speak for them and is using their potential political power in such a way as to create a state within a state. And so far they have succeeded. For it is a 'cold political fact' that Mr. Roosevelt, who has braved concentrated wealth, has not braved the risk of losing the votes around Boston, New York, Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore."

Sometime later when Helen Larkin Seldes was in Washington as head of a delegation seeking to have the embargo lifted, she was informed by one of the most astute men in Congress that there was only one man who could do the trick. "The President, with an executive order?" she asked. "No," said the astute politician; "but the man who can give the word to the president—the only man in America who will decide: Cardinal Mundelein."

The archbishop of Chicago is the only Liberal among the heads of the Catholic hierarchy in America, one of the few Liberals in the conclave of cardinals. He has supported the New Deal, and in turn President Roosevelt expected support from him. Outside the few Catholic papers published by the laity, Cardinal Mundelein's official weekly is almost unique in America in publishing some of the unpleasant truths about the Fascism of Franco and the systematic murders which marked his bloody march from Seville to Barcelona. But when it came to anything forthright on the Spanish question, Cardinal Mundelein was unable to deviate from the "party line." He kept silent. And the embargo remained in force until a few days after Franco entered Madrid, when its stupidity and viciousness was acknowledged to the world. The Catholic Church was in politics just so long as it served its purposes.

Still more open was the action of the Church in attempting to destroy the political lives of those members of Congress who had sent a telegram of greeting to the Spanish congress, assembled in Montserrat, in February, 1938.

Sixty members of the House and Senate of several hundred asked, had the courage to sign the following cablegram: "We, who cherish freedom and democracy above all else, realize the significance of your heroic and determined fight to save the democratic institutions of your young republic from its enemies both within and without Spain. Your struggle is a stirring example to all democratic people." Fear of Catholic retaliation in their home districts kept the majority away. Those who signed knew that the Spanish Republic was still the legal constituted and only recognized government in Spain; their action was not only legal but also patriotic and in the best interests of world democracy, now hard pressed by the advancing armies of Fascism. Throughout the world great Catholic minds agreed on this.

But not so those who control the hierarchy in America. The order went out from the "power houses" in Baltimore and New York and Boston, from the editorial offices of the majority of the Catholic press, from the Knights of Columbus and other organizations, to bring every pressure possible upon the sixty Congressmen. They must recant. They must repudiate the Spanish Republic or they would be knifed at the polls come next election. The Catholic vote, one-sixth of the electorate, they were told, would be used as an integral mass against them, party lines would be blotted out—and so would they. Recant, while it is yet time!

And since no one in the world is more weak kneed than a politician, many of them recanted. Among them:

Senators Gibson of Vermont, Brown of Michigan, Herring of Iowa; Representative Allen of Pennsylvania.

Those who declared they had not meant to "favor" the

Barcelona government: Senators Byrd of Virginia, McKellar of Tennessee, Holt of West Virginia, Townsend of Delaware, Pepper of Florida, Thomas of Oklahoma, Johnson of Colorado, Bulow of South Dakota, Donahey of Ohio, McGill of Kansas, Logan of Kentucky, Minton of Indiana and Connally of Texas.

Representatives: Hildebrandt of South Dakota, Mahon of Texas, Voorhis of California, Kopplemann of Connecticut, Fries of Illinois, Cole of New York, Pearson of Tennessee, Withrow of Wisconsin, Randolph of West Virginia, Eicher of Iowa, Johnson of Minnesota, Transue of Michigan and Cooley of North Carolina.⁷

But Senators Frazier, Thomas, La Follette, Nye and Ellender had courage enough to reaffirm their faith in democratic Spain, and all of them faced a Catholic cabal in state politics later.

Asked to recant, Representative Bernard of Minnesota said: "As a Catholic I cannot believe that the Catholic people or the Catholic priesthood of America will fail to understand why I am proud to join with other democratic and humane people in sending my greetings to a parliament which maintains the sanctity of democratic institutions under such conditions."

Representative O'Connell of Montana said: "American citizens ought to know that on that struggle in Spain today depends democracy all over the world and American citizens ought to know that the determination of that success will depend on South and Central America and the United States. . . . I am an Irish Catholic from an Irish Catholic family. I know that you may be criticized by your superiors as I have been about this. All you should say is: 'It is none of your business. This is a political issue involving the freedom of this country and the world working class, the small agricul-

⁷ N. C. W. C. news service.

tural class, and those fighting under the economic heel of servitude.' But I say it is high time that the American Catholics who toil by the sweat of their brow, in the farms and fields and factories, as my Irish father, who was shot down in the city of Butte, that the American Catholics rise up and proclaim their freedom, in every Catholic church in the United States today, and throughout the world."

Previously (in a speech in Pittsburgh, November 26, 1937), Congressman O'Connell had met Catholic opposition by saying: "I am a Catholic. I bow in no way in my Catholicism to any man or woman . . . and I say that there is nothing in our religion which prohibits me from opposing Fascism and opposing war. I say to any Catholic who might attack me for standing here tonight upholding the cause of democracy in Spain that I am equally justified in opposing Fascist terror in that land as I was last summer in opposing Tom Girdler and his anti-labor forces in the United States."

CHURCH REVENGE ON O'CONNELL

Mr. O'Connell was soon to experience the revenge which his own Church and the Tom Girdlers of his own state took upon him for being liberal in politics, liberal in his Catholicism, prolabor and anti-big business.

In midsummer, 1938, O'Connell asked his constituency to return him to Congress on this platform: "For Roosevelt, not Reaction; for Progress, not poverty; for Peace, not War."

Four persons filed as opponents.

Gene Burris, a political appointee of Senator B. K. Wheeler, had a good progressive record, labor support, the endorsement of William Green. He had tried to build up a political machine in the W.P.A., having served previously as director of the division of employment. He also appealed to the Workers Alliance. In filing his application he made a

personal attack on O'Connell, especially condemning the latter's visit to Loyalist Spain and various speeches for national liberal causes. Burris was "For America and Montana First."

The second man to file was Ted Collins of Helena, a well-known Catholic layman who had served a term as state purchasing agent. Collins, running for elections two years previously, had obtained less than ten thousand votes, but now it was generally said in Helena that with the aid of the Catholic hierarchy he had a good chance to win, especially if the fight between O'Connell and Burris was fairly equal.

The third opponent, Mrs. Maggie Smith Hathaway, had the support of the Drys and many good church people. But the fourth opponent was the dark horse. He was Payne Templeton, superintendent of Helena schools. Although he filed his papers five minutes before closing time on the last day, it soon became evident that the big money men of Montana were his best backers.

The state is still in the grip of Anaconda Copper, the Montana Power company, and their subsidiaries; and of course the press was owned, controlled, bossed or bribed by the corporations, just as it had been for generations. Anaconda still owns all the daily papers in Montana with the exception of two, and they control one of the unowned. As for the so-called "independent" weeklies, the corporations control them also through advertising, the extension of banking credit, and mutual business interests. Montana is but one of many states in which there is no semblance of a free press.

No sooner had the campaign got under way than the men who own and control the state got together to direct it. A meeting was held in the Placer Hotel in Helena at which Senator Wheeler, Governor Ayers, Barclay Craighead, chairman of the Montana Unemployment Compensation Com-

mission (appointee of Governor Ayers and former secretary of Senator Wheeler), officials of Anaconda and Montana Power, Lewis Penwell, collector of internal revenue for the state, and several others decided unanimously that Burris would withdraw, after he had finished heaping up the vilifications against O'Connell, whereupon their favored candidate, Templeton, unsmirched by politics, would step in and reap the ballots.

Among the scandals which developed later were charges that an attempt had been made to persuade Collins and Mrs. Hathaway to withdraw also and that cash offers as well as promises of government positions had been made. Mrs. Hathaway, in public speeches, said that Burris had been paid \$30,000 to quit, that she herself had been given the choice of several jobs.

The press and radio went over entirely to Burris and Templeton. They were utilized almost entirely for attacking and defaming O'Connell. KGIR at Butte, KPFA at Helena, KGVO at Missoula and KGEZ at Kalispell made hourly announcements. Not only was the New Deal candidate attacked, but his mother, his deceased father, and his wife were insulted. At the Kalispell station, every hour, an anonymous telegram was read asking Catholic voters not to support O'Connell because he had allegedly deserted and repudiated the Catholic Church. This statement was false. There were also scores of falsehoods regarding the attitude of the President, the attitude of labor, the appointments O'Connell had made, his personal life, the record of his relatives; but the most frequently used propaganda was that intended to alienate the votes of men and women of his own Church.

The Catholic hierarchy of Montana entered this political campaign. It was openly in politics—and against a Catholic, too. Bishop Gilmore of the Helena diocese attacked O'Connell as an enemy of the Catholic Church, mentioning his

visit to Spain, and his public statements for democracy against Fascism, as proof. *On the Sunday before election, O'Connell was denounced in each of the seventeen Catholic pulpits of his own district. Priests instructed congregations to vote against O'Connell. In Butte the hierarchy additionally organized a telephone campaign among Catholics, an endless chain of calls, which was particularly effective in keeping all Catholics from voting for O'Connell.*

The Catholic Church was in politics.

Religion was made a bitter issue by the Catholic Church.

Cynical, astute politicians know, of course, that this is a double-edged sword, and that when Catholics, Protestants or Jews make an issue of religion it is quite easy to line up prejudices on the other side. Campaign managers thought that with the Catholic boycott complete, there would be a reaction in the form of a Protestant march across religious lines to the polls—but this never occurred. O'Connell had proclaimed himself a Catholic; as a Catholic and Christian he had protested the murders by the hired aviators of Franco, in Barcelona and elsewhere. He was not an enemy of the Catholic Church, only of the Fascists in it. But that was not enough for the Protestants. Even bigoted anti-Catholics refused to support him because of his Irish name and a rumor that O'Connell had appointed a majority of Catholic postmasters.

Likewise, the Masonic orders, which might have frankly supported the man the Catholics were attacking, refused to act, and their reason was even more significant. The Free Masons of Montana belong to the ruling class. They are the men of property and wealth, the men of the Anaconda, the press and the power companies. They were opposed to the New Deal, and did not care very much about religion or other issues so long as they could keep Liberals out of office. The long-fought, always unseen, always present war between

the Haves and the Have-nots was not skipping Montana, and the religious issue was only one of the minor red herrings—although it happened in this case to be the one which caused O'Connell's defeat.

All the Church clubs, Protestant as well as Catholic, the Civil clubs, the Chamber of Commerce, the commercial clubs, even the Parent-Teacher organization, joined with all the reactionaries and the bigots. In the final days of the campaign a dozen newspapers, most of them in Anaconda hands or influence, published special scurrilous editions. The daily newspapers of Montana, with only one exception, never mentioned Jerry O'Connell's name except to attack him, and most of the weekly papers engaged in a conspiracy of silence. The powerful machine of Senator Wheeler and Governor Ayers, plus the Catholic hierarchy, plus a campaign fund estimated at \$150,000, plus the controlled unfree and unfair press, won the field by a small margin. The Church had its revenge on a liberal Catholic.

CHURCH AND EMBARGO POLITICS

On the matter of the embargo, of fighting political friends of Loyalist Spain, on any Spanish question, in fact, the Catholic Church in the United States—unlike the Catholic Church of France, for example, where a church is expected to be in politics—was in politics deeper than at any time in its history. The case of Representative O'Connell was repeated, with variations, in many states. Pressure in Washington was terrific and unceasing. And it is questionable whether there were a round dozen priests who refrained from using their pulpits for pro-Franco purposes.

How effective the campaign was can be seen from a survey of activities, in mid-January, 1939, made on Long Island. No less than 90 per cent of the 1,153,792 Catholics there

received appeals from their pastors and parish priests for letters and telegrams urging the government to retain the embargo on the shipment of arms to Spain. (The moment Franco won there was not a peep of opposition to lifting the embargo, and yet the entire campaign to keep it was made on the hypocritical assumption that embargoes were a means of preserving peace for the United States, because with no sale of arms abroad we would be saved from following our munitions with our men.) In most instances priests made the embargo appeal from the altar during mass, "a rare procedure where an international political situation was involved."

The survey, made by Mrs. Edna Garde, president of the Ladies Auxiliary of the International Catholic Truth Society (of Brooklyn), showed that of the twenty-five pastors of the largest congregations, ranging from 5,000 to 15,000, twenty-four pastors replied that at masses during Sundays in January they had preached against lifting the embargo or had authorized the distribution of form letters of protest to Congressmen, or permitted the circulation of pro-embargo petitions. In some parishes, the Catholic Action group, St. John's University undergraduates who call themselves Minute Men, took up the petitions; in others, the International Catholic Truth Society did the work, in still others the pastors wrote their own petitions.

There were other variations: in St. Patrick's, Fort Hamilton, Brooklyn, ushers distributed petitions at each mass, addressed to Senator Wagner; at St. Vincent's Ferrer's, Greenwood Road, Brooklyn, no less than 4,000 signatures were obtained during a Sunday; and at Our Lady Help of Christians, Brooklyn, a total of 5,000 signatures was expected as a result of a series of sermons.

The Church got out the "vote." And yet we now know that only 38 per cent of its adherents were for Franco. Rare,

indeed, was the individual voice protesting this business of permitting the Fascist killers of women and children to conquer a country with unlimited German and Italian arms, while the defenders of democracy—labeled “reds” by Hearst and the Catholic Church, and therefore apparently justified subjects of slaughter—should be overwhelmed. Of the few voices of protest here is a most interesting one: “I never broke formally even in my own mind with the Catholic Church—until yesterday,” writes a descendant of a pious Catholic family; “consequently I was present at the Sunday service at which this appeal for Rebel Spain was made throughout the Philadelphia area, and perhaps, for all I know, nationally.

“What I object to is not so much the Catholic Church’s decision to uphold the Loyalist embargo, as its presentation of that decision to its members. Were they invited to a mass meeting. . . . Were they given literature. . . . No! They filed into church and were handed down from above a statement of the archbishop’s ideas on the subject and then ‘in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost’ the Neutrality law and proposed changes were ‘explained’ to them. . . . Not once in this masterly misstatement of the facts were the real issues of the war itself or our relations to it brought out of hiding.

“This church of my fathers wields a tremendous influence over the illiterate, over indifferent middle-class families who find it simpler to accept the word of that institution than to think for themselves, over the thousands of children educated in its school systems. . . . I appeal to even the faintest pink liberals within its folds to think on these things and make themselves heard before their religious institution replaces the American Legion as the chief force driving toward American and world Fascism. K. L., Philadelphia, Pa.”

PRO-REACTIONARY LEGISLATION

On the assumption that the majority of Catholics are liberal and democratic, even on the Spanish question, what other explanation can there be to the daily victory of the reactionary minority in the Church, than the assumption that only the hierarchy is reactionary? The fact that the reactionaries usually win and the Liberals usually lose, is repeated every day.

In the President's first reorganization bill, for example, Monsignor Ryan of Catholic University not only declared in its favor but also proposed a constitutional amendment so that "reform legislation would be safe against attack on the grounds of unconstitutionality by future Supreme Courts." Archbishop Edward Mooney of Detroit refused a request that he protest the passage of the bill. Monsignor Michael J. Ready informed Congress that unless the measure extended administrative control of educational agencies, there was no reason to suppose Catholic interests were concerned.

But Father Coughlin ranted, over a nation-wide radio hookup, about "a threat to freedom of speech, press and religion," a totalitarian state, the destruction of the parochial schools, and similar nonsense—and the Coughlinites, aided by non-Catholic reactionaries, swamped Congress with protests and won the battle. Heywood Broun protested this sort of pressure. Immediately the *World-Telegram* editors were overwhelmed with letters from Coughlinites which called the columnist a "skunk," said his writings were "lousy" and that the writer "smelled on rye bread."

In the matter of child labor legislation the same alignment of reactionaries against Liberals, and the same result, reactionary victory, has been the history in state and national legislatures. Who was it that "cracked the whip" over the

Massachusetts legislature to prevent the endorsement of the Federal Child Labor Amendment? According to Michael C. Flaherty, secretary of the Boston Painters' Union and himself a Catholic, it was Catholic Cardinal O'Connell who did it. Year after year, whenever child labor bills come up, the cardinal has made private or public declarations and sent his agents with others. In 1937 the emissary was the Rev. Michael J. Ahern. "The cardinal cracks the whip and the legislatures do his biddings," concluded the labor leader.⁸

The Most Reverend Michael Joseph Curley, archbishop of Baltimore, whose diocese and ecclesiastical domain includes the National Capital, used the pulpits of his diocese to attack President Roosevelt's Supreme Court enlargement plan. The Catholic leader's political views, says the *New York Sun* (March 1, 1937), were "made known to communicants at all masses in the diocese yesterday when their attention was called to an editorial by the Archbishop in the *Catholic Review*, the diocesan paper."

The archbishop, in a two-column front-page attack on Monsignor Ryan, said:

"Mgr. Ryan has a Fascist dictatorial mind—if you do not agree with him you are an ignoramus or you are definitely hostile to the poor, the working man and others in distress.

"Mgr. Ryan thinks that we on the *Review* are dumb. He wants sycophants and cowards (not all of them in Congress are sycophants and cowards) to give President Roosevelt power not only to control the Supreme Court of the United States in his own administration but until the crack of doom.

"Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler and Caballero—Mgr. Ryan would make pikers of you."

Mgr. Ryan had also been attacked for his stand in favor of the passage of the Child Labor Amendment. His reply to

⁸ Associated Press report, *New York Times* and other papers, February 20, 1937.

all attacks was: "My silence seems to have them irritated and worried. I expect to stay so."

An interesting question has arisen following the numerous attacks of the reactionary hierarchy upon the leader of the minority liberal wing of that organization. It is, has Monsignor Ryan been silenced, has he chosen the silent role through intimidation, or has his silence been free and voluntary?

At any rate, it is significant that while the reactionaries shouted, the Liberal remained silent.

Or take the case of the amendments to the constitution of the state of New York. Some of them were good, some bad, some political, some social and others economic, and they were crudely lumped into eight lots. Naturally enough, lay and clerical press discussed them and urged readers to vote one way or another.

On November 6, 1938, the Catholic Church instructed all its adherents to vote Yes on items 1, 4, 6 and 8, the so-called omnibus amendment which provides *inter alia* for free bus service for pupils in parochial schools; the housing slum clearance amendment; labor's bill of rights and the social-welfare amendment. The appeal signed by Bishop Stephen J. Donahue, administrator of the archdiocese of New York, was read in every Catholic church at every mass; the letter was mentioned from the pulpits of the diocese of Brooklyn, it was also made public at St. Patrick's Cathedral where small pasteboard cards urging four Yes votes were placed in the pews and stacked on tables near the five principal doors, and similar cards were distributed to all passers-by on the street.

Was this a political action inside the church? Bishop Donahue said in his letter that the amendments favored "are so closely related to the health and social welfare of all the men, women and children of our state that I wish

to invite your particular attention to them. . . . Amendments numbered 1, 4, 6, and 8 are concrete expressions of concern for the plain people. . . . Loyalty to American ideals demands that we give prayerful consideration to all proposed changes in our basic laws. . . ."

Monsignor J. Francis McIntyre, chancellor of the archdiocese, asked if the reading of a letter of this sort was in accordance to custom or unprecedented in the history of the Church, replied: "We have never had a situation like this before."⁹

Naturally enough, the reputable Protestant press, while approving almost the same numbered amendments, commented critically on the fact that the Catholic Church openly entered the political arena, instead of utilizing its secular organizations, the Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society, and numerous others, to carry out its political wishes. But this was not the first time that the parochial school question had entered politics either in New York state or elsewhere. Two years earlier, the *Christian Century* said of a similar episode in another state:

"Just what the Roman Catholics mean when they say that their church never goes into politics, and that the areas of church and state are so distinct that there can be no conflict between them unless the state invades the field of the church, can be partly judged by what is beginning again to happen in Ohio.

"The fight for public money for parochial schools is on again. The news service of the National Conference of Jews and Christians announces: 'The Roman Catholic See of Cleveland threw a bombshell into a quiet situation when it announced a complete slate of pledged candidates a few days before the primary election of May 12.' Twenty out of the twenty-four democratic nominees for the legislature

⁹ *New York Times*, Nov. 7, 1938.

from that county are pledged to support the Catholic demand for state aid for parochial schools. Rev. John R. Hagan, head of the Catholic schools of the diocese, says that 'aid for Catholic schools is not a matter of politics; it is simple justice.'

"Anything, that is to say, that is a matter of justice is not a matter of politics! Or any group may put a ticket in the field to elect a legislature to give it anything it claims is justice, and that isn't politics either! Just what is politics then? . . ."

CHAPTER 7

Catholics and Political Machines

THE Church concerns itself with morals and ethics, but Catholic individuals and organizations concern themselves with social and political problems. No Church, nowadays, can abstain from participating in the social-economic life of a nation, nor does anyone insist that it should, but so long as ours is a democratic system it is our right to suggest that the participation does not run counter to the currents of democracy.

To illustrate: The political machine of Jersey City, as has been well established, is corrupt. It is not only financially corrupt but also morally corrupt. The law is broken there, and undue pressure is brought by an arrogant majority against a Liberal and Progressive minority which seeks to uphold the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights.

The fact that Mayor Hague is a Catholic and that a large number of politicians in Hudson County are Catholics need not enter the story, were it not for the fact that the mayor is upheld in his fight against free speech and the democratic system of government by various Catholic organizations, including the Catholic War Veterans, the Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Societies, and others closely affiliated with or under the control of the Church. Moreover, the reactionary part of the Catholic press—as distinguished from the liberal press which abominated the mention of the

mayor's name—boasts of Hague as a Catholic mayor, and when he calls one of his Hitlerlike meetings where he can rave against civil liberties organizations and liberal leaders, bishops and priests help him, and sit on his platform to give the moral support of the Catholic Church (of Jersey City) to one of the most illiberal, anti-Liberal and undemocratic leaders in the country.

There are corrupt political machines in many cities—New York under Tammany, Chicago, Kansas City, smaller towns in New Jersey—where the men in control may be Catholic or Protestant, but so long as a church does not openly ally itself with the gang in power it is not open to criticism. In Jersey City there is no doubt of the fact that the Catholic Church has allied itself with the gang in power.

This gang in power attacks the liberty of others. It violates the constitutional rights of minorities. It defies the laws of the state and nation. It refuses to enforce a ruling of the Supreme Court which guarantees the right of a free press to those who distribute leaflets as well as those who publish newspapers praising Hague. And the archbishop, the bishops, the priests supporting such a regime not only make themselves liable to reprisal, but surely open themselves to honest criticism, not only from liberal and progressive Catholics (who have spoken up bravely) but from all who fight illegalism, intimidative pressure, reactionary and Fascistic methods. The Ku Klux Klan acted in this manner, and the Catholic hierarchy in Jersey City has endorsed the gang which has acted just as intolerantly.

Archbishop Walsh of Jersey City is a great personal friend of Mayor Hague's, but diplomatic enough to refrain from public commendation of the Hague machine. But New Jersey Catholic clergy dare to speak publicly in favor of the most un-American politician in America.

For example, the Rev. Matthew J. Toohey of Newark,

state chaplain of the Catholic War Veterans, told the organization's national convention that "the battle of the century is being fought in Jersey City to determine whether the brand of Americanism that is endeavored (sic) to be proclaimed by Morris Ernst and Roger Baldwin and his ilk (sic) will prevail." The issue was the Bill of Rights—free speech, freedom of assembly, free press—and the courts upheld Ernst and Baldwin and the American Civil Liberties Union against Hague on every point.

But according to Monsignor John J. Murphy of Sacred Heart Church, Vailsburg, the United States Constitution "is observed better in Jersey City than in any other city in the country." The monsignor attacked all critics of the Jersey Hitler, especially Representative O'Connell, of whom he said: "If Jerry O'Connell is a Catholic, then I'm a Communist. He disgraced a Catholic college by graduating from it." Finally the learned monsignor attacked the American Newspaper Guild, the union of the great majority of all newspaper workers in the country, the writers of all the news of the nation, whose writings he called "tripe."

Or the Rev. Denis J. Comey, president of St. Peter's College in Jersey City. When the Jesuit organ *America* courageously said that Mayor Hague had "come out into the open with a policy which every Catholic and every American citizen who holds the Constitution is something more than a scrap of paper, must unhesitatingly reject," the Jesuit priest accused the Jesuit weekly of not knowing the facts—which were known to everyone—and defended "the Catholic War Veterans, the Knights of Columbus, the groups of Holy Name men and students of St. Peter's college" who had backed Hague in his great anti-C.I.O. and anti-civil liberties rally in the National Guard armory in Jersey City.

Father Comey's reference to groups of Holy Name men instead of the entire Holy Name Society is explained by the

fact that at least one group fought Hague: the branch of which John Longo is president. But with this exception the Holy Name went along with all Catholic organizations as directed by the priests and politicians of Jersey City. When Hague began to fight the C.I.O.—it has always been part of his policy to suppress unions and give manufacturers cheap labor—the Holy Name Society printed thousands of notices to members which each group president sent out, rallying the organization for Hague's purposes. One of these Holy Name Society letters reads in part:

Representatives of the Communists and other Red, radical groups are attempting to invade Jersey City, behind the mask of a labor organization, and to obtain a foothold here. Mayor Frank Hague has taken a firm and courageous stand against these enemies of religion and our American institutions. All the people of Jersey City have been invited to attend a monster demonstration of loyalty to the Mayor at Jersey City Armory. . . .

We have promised him that every member of the Holy Name Societies will be present. . . . I ask that you do not fail to be present. . . .

Fred J. Kropke, president
St. Peter's Holy Name Society

Busses will be stationed at the Parish Hall at 7:45

Similarly the Hudson County Holy Name Federation, convening in St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Church in Jersey City, approved an investigation to determine the character of a proposed speech by Roger Baldwin, director of the Civil Liberties Union. Peter J. Fleury, president of the federation he claims represents fifty-two churches and 85,000 members in Hudson County, said that if Baldwin "speaks on communistic ideas he can expect the same opposition he received in Jersey City." Mr. Baldwin as usual spoke on

civil liberties. The confusion between the two subjects exists only in the mind of Jersey reactionaries.

Deepest-dyed among them is the Catholic War Veterans, whose first state vice-commander, Charles Brophy, issued a statement saying if the "red communistic leaders"—meaning apparently members of congress and representatives of the C.I.O.—tried to "invade" Jersey City, the Catholic War Veterans and others would "take the law into their own hands." In seconding a resolution passed at a veterans' rally, Brophy announced his organization would have 800 men in uniform, "each equipped with a two-foot rubber hose" in the forthcoming demonstration. To which Colonel Hugh Kelly, secretary to Governor Moore and president of the New Jersey League of War Veterans, replied,¹ "Get the 800 there, and don't forget, boys, wear your uniform." Commissioner of Public Safety Daniel Casey thought the Brophy-Kelly threat to violate the Constitution just "the over enthusiastic" expression of a veteran, but he also insisted that Congressmen O'Connell and Bernard not be permitted to "infringe upon the rights of our citizens" by speaking in New Jersey. Whereupon Mr. Brophy added² that "not only 800 Catholic war veterans will be in Journal Square. That number will be doubled and increased by thousands of other veterans, stung to action by this outrage against law and order in a peaceful and law-abiding community. They will take the law into their own hands and drive out these Red leaders."

Representative Bernard applied to Secretary of State Hull for a passport "before venturing onto the foreign soil of Fascist Jersey City."

The *Catholic News* of New York³ applauded the great

¹ *World Telegram*, May 6, 1938.

² *World Telegram*, May 11, 1938.

³ January 15, 1938.

Hague rally, where notable Catholic leaders sat on the stage with the Catholic politicians and the reactionaries of other sects.

The Hearst press, the publicity organs of America's No. 1 Fascist, applauded the Hague machine.

Mayor Hague continued to attend the 10:30 Mass at St. Aedan's Church every Sunday. He had previously donated \$50,000—out of a salary of \$8,000 a year—to build a main altar for this church. Mayor Hague continued to receive the applause of not only the clergy but also the Chamber of Commerce and every enemy of labor and liberty.

Opposed to Hague was every Liberal and Progressive in the country, including all Catholic liberal and progressive men; publications and organizations. *The Catholic Worker* group and their weekly paper, which has a circulation of more than a hundred thousand, the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, the several largely Catholic C.I.O. unions, Messrs. Tim O'Brien, Joseph Zarrella and William Callahan, who distributed anti-Hague leaflets, the *St. Louis Catholic*, William J. Carney, regional director of the C.I.O. of New Jersey, *America*, *The Commonweal*, *La Voce del Popolo*, the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, the *Milwaukee Herald-Citizen*, *The Queen's Work*, and finally the leading clerical Catholic liberal in America, the Rt. Rev. Monsignor John A. Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference—all these and many more were active in the fight against Hague.

One of the strangest episodes was the Longo case. When the priests and prelates, lay and clerical organizations, veterans, big business leaders, bookmakers, politicians and grafters lined up for Hague, the notable opponent was a lad named John R. Longo, a devout Catholic, Progressive, and head of one of the Holy Name Society branches. He was promptly removed from this post by Mgr. Ernest Monteleone of Our Lady of Sorrows Roman Catholic Church. Where-

upon Catholic labor leader Carney wrote Monsignor Monteleone in protest. "Being a member of the Catholic Church all my life, an altar boy for nine years in which I served the mass of hundreds of priests, and knowing the principles of the Catholic Church," wrote the C.I.O. regional director, "I am shocked to read of your statement in the papers where you, without any hearing at all, only from people obviously prejudiced against the C.I.O., dropped a devout member of our church who was duly elected to the membership of the Holy Name Society and not only from his office as assistant secretary, but also as a member.

"I was taught from the first time I entered the Ursuline Sisters School that the Catholic Church believed in a system of democracy instead of dictatorship. If the statement attributed to you in the paper is true, you have not only acted as a tool for Hague, but you also set yourself up in the eyes of liberal minded Catholics as a dictator in your congregation.

"With all due respect to my Catholic brethren in Jersey City, I must say that in backing Hague in his fight against the C.I.O., that they have been very unfair, they have not given me as Regional Director, the privilege to present the C.I.O.'s side to them in this fight for the right to organize in Jersey City.

"Therefore, I believe that you have gone beyond the powers vested in you as a priest or pastor of a Catholic congregation, when you take it upon yourself to expel a member from any Catholic organization for merely expressing his views."

In conclusion, Carney quotes Cardinal Mundelein's warning against politicians who use the Red scare to cover their corrupt deeds.

Longo was reinstated. The episode is one of many illustrating the fact that Catholics are divided, as most groups

are nowadays, between reactionaries and Progressives. Unfortunately, the reinstatement of Longo in his Holy Name Society did not change the attitude of the majority of branches of this organization which remain pro-Hague even today.

Among the few but important Catholic publications attacking Hague is *The Commonweal*. This weekly, incidentally, revealed a fact the daily newspapers knew and suppressed: that the Hagueites were also anti-Semites. Said *The Commonweal* ⁴ of the May Day riot in Jersey City:

Typical of the police attitude was the treatment one officer, with the badge of inspector, gave a young Jew who was obeying the orders of police in the square to leave the vicinity. The Jewish youth headed south on Hudson Boulevard away from the square. As he passed the inspector, he was grabbed, spun around and propelled back toward the square with a vigorous shove and a stream of abusive language. The bewildered youth obediently started back to the scene of most of the disturbance. Seeing my press card and perhaps catching the raised eyebrow, despite the murk of the darkened hallway from which I watched, the inspector walked over to me and explained his conduct: "That fellow hasn't washed his face since he left Union Square. That's the only reason I pushed him around."

A few minutes later I saw a crowd collecting a block east at Sip Avenue. I hurried up in time to see a policeman with a lieutenant's badge haul a disheveled Jew to the curb, twisting the youth's rumpled coat into a knot. He pitched the youth into the back seat of another of the black cars, and then, spinning about, grabbed another young fellow. "You were with him, too, weren't you?" he challenged. Without waiting for a reply, he shoved the second lad into the automobile with heavy emphasis on his next remark: "Well, we'll give you a

⁴ May 27, 1938.

ride, too." The word "ride" took on all its sinister modern connotations as he uttered it. . . .

The writer concludes by saying it is "a matter of conscience for us Catholics to protest the cynical disregard for constitutional rights which the Jersey City police displayed that night."

The *St. Louis Catholic* spoke of "the saddening spectacle of Catholic priests and organizations 'allied with the wrong side' to use the recent words of Cardinal Mundelein. . . . Mayor Frank Hague of Jersey City and his followers stand for the brass-band type of Catholicism which is thoroughly reactionary and supports the grasping and avaricious system that has produced our wretched economic system. In their misguided efforts to fight Communism they are actually supporting the very system that breeds Communism. Every Catholic social scholar concedes that Communism is the child of godless and materialistic Capitalism."

The writer asserts that the Hague meetings are filled with intimidated men and conducted in the Hitler propaganda manner. Hague uses the term "communistic" for all persons who oppose his personal dictatorship. "It was saddening," he continues, "to see Catholics and Catholicism involved so much in this stupid performance. Jersey City has a population of about 250,000 of which 75 per cent are Catholics. There were about ten priests, including two monsignors, on the stage, supporting by their presence Mayor Hague's tragic circus.

"The mayor himself is a member of St. Aedan's parish and is said to be one of the pillars of the church. He practically built the church and rectory, through this power and money. It is pathetic to see him using his religion to bolster up his fanatical demagogism. Such power in the hand of a powerful politician like Mayor Hague will help make America a safe

place for the growth of cancerous materialism, whether it be of the Communist or Fascist variety."

The Catholic Worker is the most active anti-Hague paper in America. William Callahan, managing editor, has testified in the hearings against Hague. Miss Dorothy Day, the editor, braved the Hague police bullies by distributing to the Hague cohorts on the night of the big meeting an appeal to Catholics to quit Hague. It said in part:

It has been reported that you are solidly behind your mayor in his drive against the C.I.O., in his deliberate abridgement of civil rights. This we do not believe. Yes, we have seen your statements from the press, your war veterans, some of your clergy, your politicians and others to the effect that you, too, draw the red herring of radicalism across the path of a direct violation of civil rights. But we do not believe it. We do believe that you, the rank and file of Jersey City laity and clergy, believe in the natural rights of man as they are interpreted by our Constitution.

Don't be misled by the insinuations that all Catholics must stand behind Hague; that Catholic groups all support him. This is not so. Trying to subvert the church to nefarious purposes is a favorite trick of politicians. But the church will always stand for man's natural rights, and among these rights is that of organizing for mutual protection and betterment.

And finally, as testimony that the Catholic liberals are aware of the corruption of the political machines which Catholics often head, and particularly the Jersey City machine, here is a statement, "An Open Letter to a Catholic Politician who is an Un-Catholic Boss," addressed by the liberal publication *The Queen's Work* (November 1938) at the time Hague was foremost in the limelight:

Dear Sir: Forgive us for not addressing you by name. We have a number of reasons for not using your name, chief

among which is the fact that you have too many names. You see we are fully convinced that there are too, too many of you.

You're really quite powerful in your city. You control a great many important appointments and a large number of votes. You are generally known as the boss; you give orders, and things get done. You've large piles of money, suspiciously large piles of it, and through your office flows a constant stream of people who ask you for favors, which you either benignly grant or tactfully refuse. You distribute the patronage for men that are higher up in your party. And to ambitious young men you give instructions in what you call practical politics and what you explain as "honest" graft.

You are a "devout" Catholic, and your contributions to your parish and to Catholic charities in general are both notable and widely noted. You speak at communion breakfasts. You have a growing family, and your children are all being educated in Catholic schools. You yourself are rather proud of the degree you received from a famous Catholic college.

Yet the other night, when a group of Catholics were talking and your name was mentioned, someone made this statement: "We'll probably see a persecution of Catholics in this country within the next few years. And one of the prime causes of that persecution is"—and he mentioned your name.

He cited you as a Catholic who is in the limelight. He pointed out that somehow the public insisted upon confusing your religion with your politics. And he frankly thought that your peculiar kind of political conduct was making honest non-Catholics hate Catholics; the example that you set seemed to convince them that Catholics are grafters, petty dictators who are aligned with dirty politics.

Surely you have noticed that a number of Catholic politicians have in recent years been hauled before the courts or before the bar of public opinion. A too-large number of them have been sent to jail for stealing the public funds. We've seen the big political party in one metropolitan city, headed by a Catholic, thrown out of power after a public inquiry

uncovered a veritable plethora of corruption. During his two terms in office a well-known Knight of St. Gregory amassed close to a half million dollars, in spite of the fact that his salary was only approximately eight thousand dollars a year. Another Catholic official, a mayor, entered the millionaire class (check on mayors' salaries) and embarrassed us Catholics by booming himself as a champion in the fight on communism. One Catholic boss who held no political office but dictated the choice of those who did hold political offices made money by getting cuts on the city's gambling take. Another prominent Catholic is found to be the bosom friend of the city's most notorious racketeers and touts and the pal of a notorious white-slave dealer and of a murderer or two.

Certainly these men are not typical of the Catholic men in political life. But it is a shame and a disgrace that even one Catholic should use the instruments of democracy to betray democracy. You see we are in the midst of a most crucial fight, the three-cornered fight between communism, fascism, and democracy. True, democracy has failed in some instances, but in those instances it was undermined by corrupt politicians. We Catholics claim that we are heart and soul with democracy. What then can we say when Catholics in public—yes sometimes even Catholics who are most conspicuous in public life—betray democracy by employing graft and trickery at the polls, by padding registrations, by stealing money from the public funds, by using public positions to build up private fortunes, and by assuming powers that are practically dictatorial? . . .

Already there are signs of anti-Catholic movements in big cities that have known the disgrace of "Catholic" graft and "Catholic" bossism. . . .

Because some of the so-called Catholic leaders have disgraced democracy by their use of ward-heeler methods and by their dipping into the public treasury, all Catholics are going to be accused of being the enemies of democracy.

We Catholics protested long and loudly because we, twenty million strong, were not adequately represented in public

office. But when we stop to consider how some of the Catholic politicians have misrepresented and continue to misrepresent us, we wonder whether it might not be better for us Catholics if we had fewer public servants who claimed to be Catholics.

The confessional is the place for the discussion of this thing called "honest" graft. It would seem that there would be some necessity for restitution when a public official can have a magnificent country estate, a winter home in Florida, a fleet of motor cars, a Roxy chorus of house servants, an annual trip to Europe, and a bank account of something like a half-million dollars on a salary of less than ten thousand dollars a year. . . .

But let's not bother about that right now. Let's bother about the fact that all over the country Catholic politicians are on trial for political dishonesty . . . there is one Catholic politician who went so far as to introduce a modified Hitlerism into his district and has thereby given communists a valid excuse for exciting public investigations and for pointing an accusing finger at Catholics in general. . . .

. . . Have Catholics been better, more honest, more democratic in politics than have other men? Or have Catholics blunted their consciences, gone to the limits of lawlessness and immorality and again and again given us a bad name in the political world?

Yes; the day may come when Catholics in the United States will be persecuted. It would be horrible if the excuse for that persecution were your dishonesty and your betrayal of democracy.

Very sincerely yours,
The Queen's Work Staff.

No race, religious or color lines are drawn in the great American game of crooked politics. The underworld, the demimonde, and the upper crust are equally involved; and no one asks if the Capones and the Dutch Schultzes and the Jimmy Hines are Protestants, Catholics or Jews, and Negroes were welcome in the great policy racket which eventually

trapped a notorious Tammany leader. In the case of the corrupt political machine of Jersey City, as we have seen, the liberal and intellectual leaders of Catholicism were opposed to it, the antidemocratic and obscurantist leaders supported it. Unfortunately, the latter were not only the majority, they made possible all the evil which flourished in Hudson County.

What is this corruption? It was first exposed by David G. Wittels in a series of articles in the *New York Post*, from which source and from subsequent exposures in courts, before the La Follette Civil Liberties commission, and the press, the following summary is made:

1. In seven years Mayor Hague got no more than \$56,000 in salary. He bought a house for \$125,000 in Deal. He has a \$7,000 apartment in Jersey City. He maintains an apartment in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. He spent \$50,000 on his church. He makes trips to Europe and Florida, accompanied by a body guard. He lives like a millionaire.
2. Jersey City's elections are notoriously corrupt. John Ferguson, superintendent of elections, has said that "the only way to have an honest election in Hudson County is to call out the militia. The way things are under Mayor Hague it is futile and ridiculous for us to attempt to hold further elections. Insane asylum inmates, non-residents, and the dying have been voted by the machine. In one district the vote was 2,206 to 1, for a Hague candidate. Hague himself on his fifth re-election as mayor received 110,000 votes to 6,000. At times there have been more votes cast than voters registered.
3. When land is bought for public building in Hudson County there is a sudden increase in value—from \$60,000 to \$300,000 in one instance. Several parcels were found to be owned by a certain H. S. Kerbaugh. At a legislative investigation Hague refused to say whether he had deposited

\$100,000 in the National City Bank a few days following one of these deals. The legislative committee's attorney, Roland Watson, called the transactions "conspiracies under legal forms" and invited Hague to sue him for libel.

4. The state had to pay \$9,000,000 extra for the Pulaski three-mile skyway over the Jersey meadows. In the construction of this road there were bloody labor disturbances in which non-union contractors used strikebreakers with murder records. The Jersey City tax rate has trebled in twenty years; the debt has increased 500 per cent; the budget has increased 450 per cent. The bonded debt, at more than ninety-three million, is ten times greater than that of other cities of comparable size. Both Kansas City and New Orleans, run by corrupt machines, spent only a fourth as much as Jersey City for government.

5. Corruption and Big Business go hand in hand in Jersey City. Hague is the enemy not only of the C.I.O. but of the A. F. of L. He has made his an open shop town. Manufacturers escape to Hudson County to evade agreements with unions in New York and elsewhere. The Jersey City Chamber of Commerce boasts that "largely as a result of our activities covering a period of years we are able to state that the industries of this city are more than 80 per cent open shop." Labor union activity is called "labor racketeering." Hague was instrumental in defeating an anti-injunction law, which progressive states have passed.

6. The following constitutional rights have been denied labor and political organizations and leaders in Jersey City:

- a. Right of assembly.
- b. Right to picket peacefully.
- c. Right of prisoners to have counsel.
- d. Right of an adjournment in order to obtain witnesses and counsel.

- e. Right to have bail set; right to reasonable bail.
- f. Right of free speech.
- g. Right to distribute political literature. This right was denied by the police immediately after the Supreme Court of the United States reaffirmed it.
- h. Right to have a stenographer take notes in court.
- i. Right of freedom of arrest without probable cause; right of freedom from unlawful seizure.
- j. Right to a public trial.

7. The total "take" from racketeering, graft, blackmail of corporations which fight the unions, the horse race betting industry, etc., in Hudson County is estimated at \$50,000,000 a year for the political machine.

Young Mr. Longo informed the present writer that the "brain trust" of the corrupt political machine consists of a group of laymen leaders in the Catholic Church. He says that when he first began fighting the machine by organizing the Young Democrats he was taken to a Catholic retreat where religious and political pressure was applied to make him change his views. He refused and was threatened. Eventually he was arrested and jailed on a technicality.

Longo explained to the writer how the Hague machine is using the public schools for political purposes. In some schools the superintendents have been ordered to have their pupils write essays on the subject, "How Mayor Hague has Defeated the Reds in Jersey City," the Hague machine supplying the prizes.

The Hudson County machine coffers are increased tremendously by a tax of 3 per cent it levies on the salaries of all political appointees. In short, Mr. Longo explained, the machine is a combination of the crooked politicians, race-track gamblers, scared jobholders, union-fighting manufacturers, public utility tycoons and all antisocial elements.

Full responsibility for the pre-Fascist state which Hague

has built in New Jersey lies on all his supporters: the Chamber of Commerce and the corporations which fight labor, the American Legion and Catholic War Veterans, the Democratic Party headed by President Roosevelt and Mr. Farley, the American Federation of Labor which has remained quiescent, and the Catholic hierarchy of New Jersey which has either supported Hague or failed to make any criticism. The fact that there may be businessmen opposed to Hague and that there are A. F. of L. leaders, Legion leaders, Democrats and Catholic leaders openly fighting Hague and corruption does not save the organizations to which these individuals belong from the indictment.

"For many years," said *The New Republic* editorially, "the Church and Tammany have been so closely linked as to be indistinguishable from one another." The immediate reference was the campaign of a certain professional Catholic politician named Mahoney to use his church for an attack on Mayor La Guardia. It was the opinion of the liberal weekly that "the Catholic Church will receive some of the blame for Mahoney's shocking campaign of misrepresentation."

Between the foregoing criticism and Joseph McCabe's charge that "Cardinal Hayes has been represented on Tammany Hall's Board of Strategy since 1931 by Mgr. Chadwick, pastor of the church which these Catholic politicians frequent," there is quite a gap, and Mr. McCabe does not give any documentary evidence. But one would have to be completely politically illiterate not to recognize the close liaison between the Catholic Church in New York City and Tammany Hall. Tammany is "predominantly Irish and Catholic." There are usually one or two Jews among its leaders, and also a sprinkling of Americans of German blood, but the latter have not dominated or influenced the organization.

To the credit of the hierarchy, it must be said that when the Mahoney campaign against La Guardia, employing all the Red-baiting which the Church was also using but in a much more vulgar and irresponsible manner, reached a climax with Mahoney men spreading printed hate propaganda on Catholic church steps, Cardinal Hayes disowned the dirty business. "I am authorized to state that the Church has had nothing whatever to do with this attack on your integrity," said the letter the Church sent the mayor. "Many pastors tried to prevent the distribution of this literature. . . . Obviously we have no control over the distribution of literature in the public thoroughfare. . . ." *The Commonwealth* told Mahoney he was laboring under a serious misapprehension if he thought "that the Church disapproves of radicalism as such. Certainly the papal encyclicals on labor are as profoundly radical, in the proper use of the word, as is Marxism. . . . Mr. Mahoney's ill-advised campaign strategists would seem to align the church with reaction and complacency. . . ." What the strategists did was to make a Communist out of every Liberal, Laborite and Progressive, in an endeavor to smear the opposition to Tammany.

The Church took no action when John J. O'Connor, whom Paul Anderson once called "the greatest individual obstacle to good government in New York," raised the same red herring in an attempt to hold his congressional seat against James H. Fay. Here, as in many other instances, the dispute was between two Catholics, the Liberal versus the reactionary, but unlike most cases regretfully reported in this volume, victory was won by the former. O'Connor had the support of Father Coughlin. A special issue of *Social Justice* was sent free to every voter in the Sixteenth Congressional District. In addition to boosting O'Connor, this issue contained the forged *Protocols of Zion* and some of Coughlin's own anti-Semitic propaganda.

When the "Red" charge against Fay failed, the opposition stirred up a Catholic issue. A letter had been sent out to the Catholic clergy in the name of Rev. John B. Harney, superior general of the Paulist Fathers, saying that a Fay supporter had telephoned Father Molloy of the Paulist publication *Wisdom*, asking him to say that O'Connor was responsible for Order losing its radio station, WLWL. To which Fay replied that the whole matter was a plot by Congressman O'Connor or his agents, and furthermore that O'Connor had made an attempt throughout the campaign to identify himself with the Catholic Church for political purposes.

"As a Catholic, familiar with the traditional aloofness of the Church from politics in this country," said Fay, "I have been loath to allow the church to be brought into this contest in any way. . . . The Congressman and his advisors . . . have gone too far, and I must speak out in the interests of the Church as well as my own protection." Fay pointed to handbills advertising O'Connor meetings at Catholic churches and parochial schools. Nevertheless, the youth Boss Murphy had trained in Tammany traditions and who had won fifteen campaigns, was "purged" in November 1938 despite his attack on the New Deal as communist, his sneers at the President of the United States, and his effort to make politics out of religion.

One who does that is District Attorney Samuel J. Foley of the Bronx, who apparently is not aware of the fact that Washington and others separated Church from State some time ago and that religion has no place in the administration of the laws of this country.

Foley stupidly banned the issue of the weekly *Life* containing stills from the film "The Birth of a Baby," which is sponsored by leading doctors and laymen of the nation. Roy E. Larsen, publisher, was arrested. In defense of his

outrageous action—there is nothing immoral in the picture—Foley said at a communion breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the New York Fire Department: “My ideas are Catholic ideas and American ideas . . . I try to live as a Catholic and administer my job as a Catholic.”

“In these changing times,” said Foley, “people are impatient with adherence to standards of decency decreed by Catholic traditions.” He called them “sneerers at God.” But even the Constitution permits such sneerers to hold office, and the law of the land does not ask Catholic or Protestant or Jewish or atheistic administration of a public office, but insists on nonreligious administration.

As every newspaperman knows—it is one of the things he must learn the first day—the most dangerous subject is religion, and the most sacred cow in the journalistic menagerie is the Catholic Church. Protestants and Jews must be protected from criticism, and every mention of Christian Science which the leaders of this Church find objectionable will result in an immediate protest; but the sect which is most sensitive, less given to forgive an honest error, and most strongly organized for retaliation, is the Roman Catholic Church, and it must therefore be mentioned with the greatest caution. Except when in praise.

Thus we come down to the 1938 political campaign in the state of New York with the main issue religion, and not a word about it in any newspaper.

Let me quote a Brooklyn Catholic layman, holder of a high political office, and not unknown to Bishop Molloy, Father Curran (of *Brooklyn Truth* fame) and Patrick Scanlan (of *Brooklyn Tablet* fame), but for the moment unidentified for the reader. He is one of several broadminded Catholics with whom the writer has discussed the contents and tenor of this book. He says:

"There is no doubt that the Catholic Church in America and elsewhere is split on many questions, notably the Spanish problem, Fascism, Reaction in general. . . .

"It is also obviously true to everyone in politics that the whole issue in the 1938 campaign in New York State was religion. It was a triple issue: Jewish, Catholic and anti-Semitic.

"I regret to say that there is a growing anti-Semitism among Catholics. Coughlin and the German Bund leaders are directly responsible for this, and the Spanish war was made an excuse, but the real purpose is purely Nazi propaganda. I also regret to state that Brooklyn, the home of my friends, Father Curran and Mr. Scanlan, has been very thoroughly propagandized by the Coughlinites and Bundists. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, for example, was persuaded to pass an anti-Semitic resolution.

"The most interesting thing about the 1938 campaign was this: that the Catholic Hierarchy and the Democratic Party, and its candidates, Lehman for governor, Poletti for lieutenant governor, were in accord. Governor Lehman was not running M. William Bray, a Catholic, for lieutenant governor, for certain personal reasons: he wanted to be relieved of much work in the future—in fact he did not want the job at all—and Bray was not the man to spend all his time in Albany doing the governor's work. Poletti, although of Italian descent, was not a Catholic. The usual political deal had been made. The Catholics were to get certain big offices in exchange. The hierarchy was pleased and gave the word to support the ticket.

"But this was one of the few times where the rank and file went against the wishes of the 'power house.' There is no doubt that Lehman and Poletti, and especially Lehman, was knifed by our people, and there is no doubt that it was because he was a Jew and because a powerful anti-Semitic

campaign among Catholics had been carried on by certain interests. To repeat, the Catholic Church did not want Bray as lieutenant governor. But Bray was made the religious issue by the anti-Semites. Nothing could stop this movement. It almost defeated Lehman and Poletti. When, several weeks after the election, Governor Lehman appointed Michael F. Walsh of Brooklyn, then United States attorney for the Eastern District of New York, to the office of Secretary of State, he was paying the political debt due the Church for its support to the party."

Lehman first met Catholic opposition in his 1936 campaign when his veto of the parochial school free bus bill—which he believed unconstitutional—was made an issue. The matter of law, justice, constitutionality, hardly ever enters minds already saturated with religious fanaticism. Or with political fanaticism.

All the usual elements, the patrioteers, the profiteers in Red-baiting, the American Fascisti masquerading as true Americans, and the antilabor business elements, joined to endorse numerous proposed laws which were both vicious and unconstitutional—and to attack the governor when he vetoed them. One of the most notorious of these was the McNaboe-Devany bill of March 1938 barring Communists—but not Fascists and Nazis—from public office. The American Patriots Incorporated, the Bronx Chamber of Commerce and numerous Catholic organizations were for it; the American Labor Party, the New York League of Women Voters, the liberal press, were against it. "Although I am unreservedly opposed to the principles of Communism," wrote the governor, "I am vetoing this bill in the interest of safeguarding American democracy," quoting Chief Justice Hughes and the late Justice Holmes. The action was approved by the Methodist Federation of Social Service and the New York State Federation of Teachers Union; it was

deplored by Jeremiah Cross, state commander of the American Legion, and various Catholic groups.

That same day Mr. McNaboe told the City Club that "no one can get on the relief rolls in New York City unless he joins the Communist Party," which is a falsehood, and declared that "six communists are being designated to each police officer in New York, and their duty, at a given signal, is to wipe out the 18,000 policemen in the city." The answer at the office of New York's police commissioner, was simply "Nuts." And yet it is the McNaboe activities and the campaign anti-Semites built upon the veto of McNaboe stupidities which figured importantly in the November campaign.

Immediately after the McNaboe episode the Republicans shifted their slate, making William F. Bleakley, defeated candidate for the governorship in 1936, first vice-president of the Constitutional Convention. Bleakley is a Catholic. Reports from upstate showed that Catholics there were "incensed" against the governor. Word was received from the Albany Democratic machine, controlled by the O'Connells, that a big swing in the vote was possible: instead of carrying Albany County by 20,000, it was probable that the governor would lose by 25,000. "The Catholic Bishop of Albany had been one of the most active proponents of the anti-Red measure."

Bleakley, a former New York supreme court justice, began his campaign by telling the communion breakfast of the United States Customs Holy Name Society that he did not believe that a member of a minority party should hold a public office because that was against "the principle of American government"; he also declared himself an opponent of tolerance, because tolerance was "a very unfortunate word" because it meant permitting something to exist that one did not like. He realized that a communion breakfast was a strange place for such a discussion, he said, nevertheless he

contended it was not a political but a religious question. When we hear of groups opposed to the principles of American government from time to time, he said, those groups are opposed to the principles of the Catholic Church.

By November the anti-Lehman campaign was well under way. Legion Commander Cross had said from a McNaboe platform that "no lilting melodies of freedom of speech or civil liberties will obscure the vision of our citizens when they go to the polls next November." It was purely revenge. Liberties, civil or others, were not considered.

At the psychological moment, three weeks before election, Father Curran, who is always up to his neck in politics, took a headlong dive into the whirlpool. In the midst of the Eucharistic Congress in New Orleans, which the president of the International Catholic Truth Society of Brooklyn was attending, he precipitated a religious issue in New York. He had addressed a series of questions to Poletti intended to embarrass him and help destroy the Lehman-Poletti prospects for election. Father Curran is a master of innuendo and red-herring trailing. He asked Mr. Poletti, for example, if it was true that Corliss Lamont (son of Thomas Lamont, partner of J. P. Morgan) had been Poletti's best man at his wedding, and if the latter endorsed "the Communist philosophy of Mr. Lamont." Other questions were just as mean, stupid and intimidating. Mr. Poletti at first did not reply. But when he did, suddenly, there were published his letter together with a remarkable statement from Father Curran saying it was all good clean fun, pure Americanism, and no harm meant.

What had happened in the intervening days has never been published. But when Walsh was named secretary of state it was payment not only for the Catholic vote in Brooklyn but also for fixing the Poletti affair. The newspapers

had it that Mr. Walsh "led a group of prominent Brooklyn Democrats in clearing up the tangle that developed when Charles Poletti, running mate of the Governor, was asked about his views on Communism by the Rev. Edgar Lodge Curran, president of the Catholic Truth," etc. But it was more than that. For Brooklyn Democrats, read Brooklyn Catholics. It was the usual deal between Church and state. And to say that the Church is not in politics in Brooklyn is to speak nonsense.

As my Brooklyn Catholic friend says: "We all call up Father Curran before making our speeches. If he disapproves of anything, we change it. You can't be in politics in Brooklyn without the support of Curran."

Significant episode in the 1938 campaign was the silence of Alfred Emanuel Smith, once the victim of one of the worst religious scandals in American history. Mr. Smith had frequently spoken out against Nazi anti-Semitism. In November 1938, when American anti-Semitism was rampant—although unmentioned in the newspapers—Democratic party leaders begged Al Smith to condemn publicly the introduction of the religious issue in the attack on Lehman. Smith refused to speak out.

As for District Attorney Thomas Dewey and the Republican political machine, they were too opportunistic not to profit from the religious strife. While it is not true that they printed the anti-Semitic literature which the Bundists distributed, it is true that they gave lip-service only to the move to keep bigotry out of politics. Mr. Dewey said openly he opposed the Catholic-Jewish issue. But the machine exploited it to the last vote. In the Spanish district in New York City, for example, the Republicans did not mind the use of the banner "Restore God to Albany," a mere plagiarism of the "Restore Christ to Madrid" slogan under which

the Fascists and Germans and Moors were butchering good Christians in Spain. It was that kind of a campaign. Nothing was too dirty for use—including the religious issues.

The part the Catholic Church plays in the affairs of state in Central and South America has been described and analyzed objectively and thoroughly by Professor J. Lloyd Mecham of the department of government, University of Texas. His book, published by the University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, is called *Church and State in Latin America*. A similar book should be written about Canada and the United States.

In addition to an investigation of the Tammany machine and the Albany machine, there should also be a complete study of affairs in the state of Massachusetts, where it is well known that the cardinal archbishop of Boston holds the whip hand over the legislature; and the situation in New Orleans politics should also be studied. The Pendergast machine of Kansas City has been destroyed, and by a Catholic United States Attorney General. The latest information from Chicago is that there has been a split between the Kelly machine and its clerical supporters. Moreover, an investigation might show that in some instances the hierarchy was actually the enemy of the political machine dominated by Catholic laymen. In every instance, however, a factual survey would be valuable.

Or the investigator might look into a minor political matter, such as the 1938 primary election in Texas where a crooning, hillbilly flour salesman made a burlesque of the democratic process of choosing our rulers. This campaign also resulted in the defeat of Maury Maverick, outstanding Progressive in the House of Representatives, who lost his seat by a handful of votes, thanks to the dirty tricks the opposition played on him and their raising the Com-

munist issue. Maverick's opponent was a Roman Catholic. He was effective in the use of Red-scare propaganda among the Mexican Catholic population of San Antonio. But the whole campaign against Maverick was based on forgery, false issues, Red-baiting, wholesale theft and corruption. Even prostitutes were threatened with the loss of licenses if they voted for Maverick. Middle-class Protestants joined Catholic voters because of their fear of Maverick's radicalism. All the anti-New Deal, antilabor, Nazi and fake patrioteers united with Maverick's opponents.

All these matters should be investigated, because the evidence is at hand that the rank and file of the Catholic Church is not Fascist or Nazi or antilabor or anti-New Deal. Every Washington observer has reported that President Roosevelt and Cardinal Mundelein were not only the best of friends, but that they also wanted to work together, each respecting and approving the other, and that the President is convinced that the Catholic Church membership will be on the liberal democratic side in future political campaigns in America. This is exactly the situation the Nazi *Angriff* attacked when it alleged "a deal between President Roosevelt and Cardinal Pacelli [now Pius XII] whereby the President made important concessions to the Catholic church in return for which Cardinal Pacelli is declared to have delivered the Catholic vote in the United States to Roosevelt."

But, says the liberal columnist Jay Franklin, "here the Teutonic cart goes before the Yankee horse. The 'Catholic vote' is not deliverable in an American election and has been eagerly cultivated by both political parties. However, since the social policies of the New Deal are in line with the great liberal encyclicals of Pius XI, a majority of Catholics have favored Mr. Roosevelt and have been, historically, members of the Democratic party. The attempt of the G.O.P. to identify the New Deal with 'Communism' has been a ma-

noeuvre designed to win over the Catholic majority. . . . So far as American Catholicism itself is concerned, it is evolving along liberal and democratic lines. . . ."

It is this friendship between Roosevelt, the New Deal, the Catholic Church and notably Cardinal Mundelein which put the President on the spot in the Spanish question. It was due to Mr. Roosevelt's "prominent Catholic friends" that he stopped the lifting of the arms embargo.⁵ "Historical responsibility for the suffocating of Spain," writes the noted journalist Edgar Ansel Mowrer, ". . . rests partly upon the American Administration and Congress. . . . President Roosevelt adopted a policy of neutrality . . . depriving the Spanish Republic of its normal right to purchase war material."

We do have this paradox of so much Fascist activity by the Catholics, clerical and lay, who monopolize the headlines, and the democratic affiliation of the Catholic masses. We do know that although Church and State are divorced in America, it is extremely difficult to separate a moral, ethical and social program from political action, and therefore there is no surprise in the activities of Methodist, Protestant, Catholic or Jewish organizations in favor of or in opposition to certain pieces of legislation. It is only when the American principles of democracy are threatened, when social progress is impeded by any organization, group, clerical or lay, that the situation calls for investigation and action by the democratic majority. All persons interested in the preservation of civil liberties, for instance, have had to take up the fight in the past against highhanded and at times terroristic action by various American Legion branches; and they have had to criticize the activities of chambers of commerce, the American Liberty League, and to fight the Ku Klux Klan. So it must be with organizations which have the same policies and the additional shield of one of the religious sects.

⁵ Pearson and Allen, *Washington Merry-Go-Round*, May 11, 1938.

Every organization, clerical and lay, has the right to tell its members what to do, but no organization has the right to exert its pressure until it interferes with the basic rights and liberties of others.

Every Church has the right to engage in politics. It may, if it wants to, operate a complete political machine—or, better still—remain the power behind the machine. It may exert such pressure that it perverts the freedom of the press and harms the entire nation. Such pressure—by intimidation and boycott and threats—is entirely legal. On the other hand, the public has a right to know the facts about such activities.

CHAPTER 8

Catholic Pressure on the Press

IN THE recent Spanish War, the war of Fascists versus the people, the American correspondents covered themselves with honor and the American press covered itself with disgrace. The publishers crawled on their knees before the prelates of the Catholic hierarchy. They exhibited a cowardice never excelled by other businessmen who deal with the general public. They surrendered the freedom of the press entirely to a minority pressure group.

In the summer of 1936 the American press was almost 100 per cent in favor of the Spanish Republic. It knew at once that Hitler and Mussolini were backing a rebellion of the militaristic and commercial elements in Spain. It knew that the main issue was land, liberty, and bread: the people, peasantry and labor unions wanted land, bread, and liberty, but the landowners, the Duke of Alba, the escaped convict and smuggler Juan March, who represents big business and big money, and the militarists, wanted to suppress the working class and middle class. It was the old class war in its latest manifestation. The religious issue was not brought in, and need not have been brought in, had not Franco and the Catholic Church decided to bring it in when they planned their Red-baiting campaign on the Spanish issue. There were as many if not more Spanish Catholics on the Government side as on the Rebel side.

Within three months the American press—with a handful

of notable exceptions some of which will be honorably named later—was either for the Fascist side or for a shameful neutrality which was in fact as well as in fancy an ally of the Fascist side. For the American Catholic pressure group it was the most significant victory in its campaign to intimidate our press.

In one instance at least, a Catholic priest and leader boasted of this corruption of our free press. At an anti-Communist mass meeting in Brooklyn, with Attorney General John J. Bennett, Jr., presiding, that same Father Curran who heads the International Truth Society charged that "the newspapers of Manhattan and Brooklyn have been very unfair to the anti-Communist group in Spain," and asserted that "because I control \$20,000 of business with one Brooklyn newspaper I have forced them to take a more liberal attitude."¹

This would have been corruption of the press if Father Curran had, through the power of his twenty thousand dollars, changed the policy of the Brooklyn paper to favor the Communists, or the Japanese, or the Holy Rollers. It is purely and simply corruption of the press when an outsider walks into the editorial sanctum and asks for a reversal of policy under threat of losing twenty thousand dollars' worth of trade. But so obscurantist is the International Truth Society president's mind that, failing to realize how unethical he had been, he boasts of the corruption.

In the case of this Brooklyn paper, moreover, it was the liberal attitude which was changed into a pro-Fascist attitude. The paper had not been unfair to the "anti-Communist group in Spain"; it had been friendly to the anti-Fascist group. There was no Communist group. The whole statement is distortion and propaganda—the half-truth which is worse than falsehood.

¹ *New York Times* and other papers, December 1, 1936.

As for the Brooklyn paper, its cowardice may be charitably excused by the fact that it was in financial difficulties at the time, and the money involved may have meant life or death. But no such excuse will do for many of our most powerful dailies which bowed the knee before the same and similar Catholic pressure groups in all parts of the country.

It was, of course, the Spanish War which brought them out into the open. But they have been at work for many years, and few if any newspapers have been strong enough to thumb their noses at the intruders. A dozen years ago Heywood Broun, attacking the pressures which make cowards of editors, and a free press impossible, said of one pressure group:

"The Irish are quite a different proposition. Admitting the danger of generalities I would contend that the Irish are the cry-babies of the Western world. Even the mildest quip will set them off into resolutions and protests. And still more precarious is the position of the New York newspaperman who ventures any criticism of the Catholic Church. There is not a single New York editor who does not live in moral terror of the power of this group. It is not a case of numbers but of organization. Of course if anybody dared nothing in the world would happen. If the church can bluff its way into a preferred position the fault lies not with the Catholics but with the editors."

Times have changed in the past decade. And for the worse, so far as freedom of the press is concerned. Ask any editor, Liberal or Conservative, Catholic or non-Catholic, and the answer is the same: the Catholic Church has organized itself in every parish in the United States and Canada "to check the journals . . . for false statements with reference to the Church and the revelations of Christ, or derogatory to Christian virtue and common decency" (according to Bishop J. M. Gannon of St. Louis), or to control and influence the press (according to our harassed managing editors).

The effort to make the news services drop the words Loyalist and Republican for the loyalist republican government of Spain failed. But the Associated Press admitted that its fear of Franco forced it to treat the news in a certain way, and this great news association's heads admitted to the writer that they took no action when certain newspapers perverted the news it sent them from Spain.

"If General Franco lays down the law as to how foreign newspaper correspondents in Spain are to write the news, that goes with the Associated Press," said the *Guild Reporter* (December 1, 1936.) "The press association admits as much." Mrs. Jessie Lloyd O'Connor had criticized the A.P. for the unfair way it presented the news. John Evans, an A.P. official, replied, denying there had been "suppression of the truth." . . . "The only reason the word Rebel is not used is because the A.P. has American correspondents in Spain who have been told at Fascist headquarters they would be punished if the term 'rebel' were applied to the insurgent forces. The Associated Press values the safety of its men more than it does a particular word especially when there is no sacrifice of principle. To call the Fascists 'insurgents' does not leave anyone in doubt as to their position. The term 'loyalist' is not used."

To which Mrs. O'Connor replied: "I do not charge that the A.P. deliberately lies about Spain. I have simply observed that the majority of people who depend on A.P. for their information have no idea that it was a liberal democratic government against which the generals rebelled, nor that any believing Catholics were ever in the government. If you don't want to call that suppressing the truth, you don't need to, but you will admit that you omit to mention these things. And that omission allows the rebels to put their propaganda across that the issue is between Christianity and Communism. Actually the issue is between a larger number of Catholics

who would like the vote and some social reform, and a small number who would like royal restoration or a military dictatorship."

The episode was a very disagreeable one. The Associated Press had admitted enough to warrant the assumption that its news from Franco Spain was colored to suit the Fascists. On the Loyalist side there was no intimidation of correspondents and practically no censorship—except as far as military secrets were concerned.

A year later, in preparing an article on the press and the Spanish war for the proposed magazine *Ken*² the present writer asked the Associated Press what it did about many newspapers, notably the Hearst press, which was changing its Spanish news in order to please the Catholics and smear the Loyalists. The first letter said that the agency's correspondents in Madrid, Lloyd and Jordan, had told me that smear terms like "Reds" for the Loyalist coalition were never used by them, therefore such words were inserted either in America or in the individual newspapers. "Does the A.P. take any action when its members change A.P. despatches to suit their own prejudices?" the letter concluded.

Executive News Editor Byron Price refused to answer. He referred me to the *Daily Mirror*, a Hearst paper which had been perverting the despatches. I insisted on a Yes or No answer. Price replied: "I see no occasion for the Associated Press to make a public statement on the subject. . . ." Finally I wrote to Kent Cooper, the general manager, who replied on January 10, 1938, saying I was "correctly informed" about the agency not coloring the news but certain newspapers doing just that. As for action against these papers, Mr.

²Ironically enough, the article was suppressed by the owner, David Smart, after the Catholic hierarchy scared the shirt off his back with a boycott of his whisky advertisers in *Ken* and *Esquire*. In planning *Ken*, Mr. Smart had told the present writer he had no fear of advertisers, but he later exhibited the largest pair of cold feet in magazine history.

Cooper said, "decision as to obligations" rests with the board of directors, and would not be made public.

These ambiguous letters are the more curious facing the fact that when a reader of *The Hudson Dispatch* of Union City, New Jersey, wrote to the A.P. asking if it was in the habit of inserting the lying propaganda words "Reds" and "communistic" when mentioning the Madrid government, the A.P. replied: "The Associated Press did not and does not use those terms in describing the Madrid government." Could it have been fear of publication of this fact which caused the later ambiguousness?

The Associated Press is a great disciplinarian. It has a system of fining its members, and it can refuse them its service if they criticize its methods. But neither Price nor Cooper would admit for publication that the Hearst and other pro-Fascist presses were violating the laws of the organization. I learned this fact from the following document kindly supplied by one of Mr. Hearst's many employees who hate him:

Jan. 19, 1938

Publishers and Managing Editors
All Hearst Newspapers:

From E. D. Coblentz

The Associated Press has complained because some of our papers have been changing their definitions of the contending forces in Spain.

This change in the Associated Press dispatches is a violation of the By-Laws, and the executives in control of the A.P. have requested that we give instructions to our editors that the dispatches be not changed in this way.

Will you please, therefore, in handling dispatches of the Associated Press relating to the hostilities in Spain, be careful not to change the Associated Press definitions of the contending forces. The general management has given assurances to

the Associated Press that this instruction would be issued and would be carried out by our editors.

Of course, the International News Service being a Hearst organization, continued to mix propaganda and prejudice with its Spanish news, much to the delight of the Catholic press, which applauded it frequently.

The United Press office in Paris informed me that it had on occasion asked Laurence Hills, pro-Franco editor of the Paris edition of the *New York Herald Tribune*, to stop changing its dispatches in the same way the Hearst press was doing, but could get no satisfaction. There is only one other item concerning this vast news agency which has come to my suspicious attention. On July 14, 1937, Webb Miller asked Franco what form of government he would establish. The answer was in writing. In the left-hand column is the United Press service version, in the right-hand column the official Franco text published later:

U.P.:

It will be similar to the regime of Italy and Germany in that it will reinforce the hierarchic principle, exalt love of country, practice social justice and the well-being of the middle and working classes; but it will have defined national characteristics. It will be a suit cut to Spain's own measure.

Franco text:

It will follow the structure of the Totalitarian regimes, like Italy and Germany. It will adopt corporative forms . . . and it will destroy the liberal institutions which have poisoned the people . . . etc.

The foregoing is but one of the dozen or more uttered and signed declarations by General Franco in which he promises a Fascist state and the destruction of democracy, liberalism, the republic, the parliamentary system, the civil liberties of

the people. Curiously enough the Catholic priests and prelates—who speak for truth—have heard nothing about this Fascist business at all, and call Franco anything but a Fascist.

Moreover, it has been the fear of Catholic reprisals which has prevented the American press from publishing the evidence that Franco is a Fascist and planned another Fascist state. The long-continued attack from the Catholic hierarchy so frightened the American press that it was afraid to publish facts and statements which have appeared in the official Fascist press itself and about which the Spanish Fascists have boasted.

The Catholic attack on our press was based on the Franco propaganda theory that the liberal republic was Red, or Communist; that the Red republic was responsible for the numerous atrocities against priests and nuns; that no priests were guilty of fighting the republic, that no church was used by the Fascists for military purposes, that the twelve or fourteen million Spaniards who fought Franco were either atheists or in the power of atheists; that a Russian conspiracy was prevented by Franco's stroke; that the Soviets intervened in Spain long before Hitler and Mussolini did; that the elections of 1936 were crooked; that, in short, there are such things as Good and Evil in this world, and nothing between, and the Franco side was Good and the Spanish majority's side Evil.

Most all these convictions were lies, or half-lies, or perversions of the truth, at best. Unlike religion, about which it is said it is wisest not to argue, there are historical facts involved which could be established in 1936, and which are more apparent now that the war is over. First of all, the main thesis, expressed from the Vatican to Brooklyn, that the Loyalist government was Red or Communist, is untrue. There were some 25,000 or a few more Communists in Spain when the war began, and some 250,000 at the end. Before the sur-

render of Madrid, the Loyalist coalition, of which the Communists were a part, drove them out with easy violence and imprisoned 10,000. They never ran the Popular Front, although American and British military experts at all times said that the Fifth Regiment with 50 per cent Communists, was the best.

As for atrocities, the Loyalists admitted that priests and nuns were killed in the chaotic days of 1936 by frenzied anti-clerical mobs, but no atrocities were committed when the government got control of the situation. On the other hand, American journalists on Franco's side were eyewitnesses to official atrocities by Franco's troops.

The evidence is overwhelming that churches were used by the Fascists and that priests co-operated with the enemies of the republic. Robert Neville of the *New York Herald Tribune* was caught in Granada. He testifies that "in a very real sense the Catholic priesthood has had its hand in the plotting of the revolt, and, once the revolt started, the clergy became virtual combatants, even though they may not have carried rifles or operated machine guns. As plotters they were entitled to little more consideration than a soldier committing treason, and for taking an active part in the ensuing combat they could no more expect immunity from attack than could any other rebels. . . ." In Granada, he continues, "the clergy's participation in the revolt . . . could be seen with the naked eye . . . I know because I saw them, that in Granada's church towers and steeples machine guns were placed and that they were used against a civilian population resisting an armed revolt against an elected government. I know—again because I saw it with my own eyes—that the churches of Granada were used as barracks for the Fascist organizations and the rebel militia and I know that in at least one church in Granada—the Church of San Geronimo—considerable ammunition was stored. In the tower of the Cathedral of Gra-

nada there were two machine guns pointing out on the adjoining square. From the heights of the Alhambra we could see armed men firing from the towers of various churches. . . . And of all the shocking sights I saw in the Spanish civil war none could compare with the spectacle of the priest . . . joking, talking and smoking with soldiers who at that moment were engaged in firing cannon from the Alhambra Hill down into the working class district. Instead of constituting sanctuary the churches have become armed fortresses. . . . The archbishop of Granada has blessed companies of the Civil Guard being sent out to 'pacify' rebellious villages and the cardinal at Seville has put his stamp of approval on the revolt by presiding at a mass in the Seville cathedral at which . . . the old monarchist flag was restored. . . . The church in Spain has been flagrantly political. . . ."

There are dozens of trustworthy eyewitness accounts of a similar nature. In the case of Robert Neville, spokesmen for the Church in New York replied by calling him a bridge expert.

The pressure group stopped at nothing. It took a lesson from Hitler and actually engaged in anti-Semitism. Father Coughlin spread the falsehood that Jews controlled the American press; Father Thorning concluded one of his more biased and distorted speeches with these words:

"Regrettably, a large number of publishers and editors have allowed their antipathy for (or valid grievances against) Hitler and Mussolini to influence their judgment in the placing and spacing of news. It is no mere accident that the newspapers conspicuous by their bias both editorially and journalistically, have been the *New York Times* (publisher, Arthur Hays Sulzberger), the *Washington Post* (publisher, Eugene F. Meyer), the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* (publisher, Joseph F. Pulitzer, Jr.), and the *Philadelphia Record* (publisher, J. David Stern)."

The anti-Semitic attack from Catholic priests became a little too much for even *The Catholic News* which took occasion in an editorial denying Jewish control of the newspapers to quote *Editor & Publisher* which, besides being the spokesman for the publishers of America, happens to be edited by a Roman Catholic. Among the newspaper owners in America there are ten or twelve, Arthur Robb wrote, of Jewish faith and descent; their papers have a combined circulation of between 2,250,000 daily and 2,300,000 Sundays, or a little more than that of the three big papers owned by Jews, namely, the *New York Times*, *Philadelphia Record* and *Philadelphia Inquirer*; and this is 5 per cent of the daily and 7 per cent of the Sunday circulation in the country. "If we know anything of the men who control these newspapers, and we know some of them intimately," says Robb, "it is that they are no more conscious of their race and religion as newspaper operators than are hundreds of their able Gentile competitors. They belong to Jewish organizations, support Jewish charities, and incidentally, we know of several who are generous contributors to Christian and non-sectarian funds. . . . There isn't a bigot among them, if only for the reason that they are too intelligent to tie their business hands by intolerance."

Even more important is the fact that there is no control and no influence of the great news channels, the agencies which supply the news of the world. On the board of the directors of the biggest of these agencies, the Associated Press, there is not one Jew; nor is there a Jew directing either Roy Howard's United Press or the Hearst International News Service. The American Newspaper Publishers Association, of which James G. Stahlman was president at the time, and the American Society of Newspaper Editors, of which William Allen White is president, have no Jews at present on the board of directors. It is true that the best paper in the country (the *Times*) is owned by a Jew; that the most liberal

paper (the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*) is owned by the son of a converted Jew, but the archrepublican *Philadelphia Inquirer* and the anti-New Deal *Washington Post* are also owned by Jews.

The attack on the *Times* has been the most vicious of all. It is true that thousands of important people, almost all the important writers, scientists, non-Catholic churchmen, social leaders and humanitarians have at times written to the *Times* protesting the actions of Franco, of Fascists, of the *Times'* pro-Fascist correspondent Carney, the Catholic bishops who endorsed Franco, and other reactionaries and undemocratic forces, but from the liberal side there came no threats, no boycotts, no insults, no intimidation. These, however, were the methods of the Catholic side.

The *Times* had three correspondents in Spain: Carney, who covered Madrid and then went over to Franco; Matthews who replaced Carney in Madrid, and Fernsworth in Valencia. It also sent occasional correspondents, one of them John Hinkle, co-operating with a priest on a series of propaganda articles for the National Catholic Welfare News Service.

On leaving Madrid in December, 1936, Carney wrote a long article in which he pretended to tell the suppressed truth about the situation. This 10,000-word cable was so obviously unfair that the *Times'* Paris office, which then did not know whether it was also false, refused to have a hand in transmitting it, and Carney had to file it himself. In this cable Carney stated that "Madrid cannot be considered an open city," a claim made by several Jesuit priests in explaining away the murder of women and children in Barcelona and other cities; but General Franco stated publicly, and Carney reported him saying, "Madrid is an open city."

Next, Carney stated that "there were foreign volunteers—the International Column as they were termed—comprising

the Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth battalions. They were mostly Russians. . . ."

This is one of the many untruths Carney sent out. There were no Russian soldiers in the International Brigade or elsewhere. (There were several hundred aviators, mechanics, specialists.)

But the chief value of the Carney reportage was for Franco. For weeks, the Madrid censorship board informed me, Carney had been mentioning gun emplacements, military units, and other military information, despite warning that such reportage constitutes espionage. This was about the only censoring the board did. So no sooner had Carney set foot in France than he published a complete list of the antiaircraft batteries in Madrid, and these were immediately shelled by Franco. According to one of the three American official observers in Madrid to whom I later spoke, any correspondent mentioning gun emplacements should be shot as a spy.

Another of Carney's tricks was reporting events on the opposite side, events he could not see, news he could not possibly get except from prejudiced and lying sources. So it was that in February, 1937, he began quoting the murderous boasts of Queipo de Llano and reporting that at Motril "the retreating government troops are reported to have burned the few remaining churches and to have executed 200 persons, including four priests who were burned alive after a gasoline bath. . . ." This is one of hundreds of fake atrocity stories which the Franco side has circulated in America.

But Carney's greatest achievement was his single-handed recapture of the town of Teruel weeks before Franco got there. The Loyalists in a surprise attack had taken the town. Franco, to save his prestige, and that of the German and Italian troops, had to retake it. A week after the Loyalist victory, Carney not only reported the Fascist entry into Teruel but also described in detail (from a safe distance) the vic-

torious marching into the town, the meeting of the victors with the besieged Fascists, the rejoicings of the population, the celebration in the streets.

This was all a fabrication.

On July 11, Carney put into the mouth of an American prisoner a statement connecting pro-Loyalist organizations in America with the Communists. This falsehood was protested by the Rev. Dr. Reissig and Bishop Paddock who pointed out that refutations had previously been published in the *Times* itself.

On the other hand, Herbert L. Matthews went into and through every battle he reported; he gave eyewitness accounts whenever possible, and when impossible he quoted his source of information, an American officer of repute, or a Spanish official. He risked his life day after day and told the truth so far as it was humanly possible.

So did Lawrence Fernsworth. Fernsworth is a Roman Catholic. Even before the war he was a contributor to the Jesuit weekly *America*, and in 1934 predicted trouble for the Catholic Church for its support of Gil Robles and others who controlled the government at the time it massacred thousands of miners in Oviedo. It is a fact that Fernsworth is actually a practicing Catholic, that he was recently married in the Catholic church in Galveston, to a Roman Catholic, and that he has exposed the propaganda of atrocities against priests and nuns as largely forgeries that has infuriated reactionary Catholics, who intrigued for years to have him fired from his post on the *Times*, and who finally succeeded.

What was Mr. Sulzberger to do in the face of protests from the democratic pro-Loyalist side and the reactionary Catholic pro-Franco side? If he were a man who wanted to face the facts of life, if he had a social conscience, if he were not afraid of losing a million or two in a great cause, he might have taken the side of the democratic forces against the Fas-

cist forces. But Mr. Sulzberger does not believe that a newspaper should take sides. He believes that the *Times* should tell only the news and let the public form its own opinions from the facts. In this instance Mr. Sulzberger could not see the difference between the proved lies of one correspondent and the factual experiences, obtained at risk of life, by another. Speaking before the Newspaper Institute of the North Carolina Press Association at Chapel Hill, Mr. Sulzberger called an unbiased newspaper essential to our democratic system; predicted that democracy would survive "if we can sustain a truly free and truly responsible press" against "the bellowing of dictators and the intrigues of those who are willing to play the dictator's game."

Mr. Sulzberger then took up the Spanish pressure. Significantly enough, the publisher did not mention the Catholics, although they are the most powerful group and were alone in this episode. He said it was not the censors on either side of the Spanish war who caused most of the difficulties, but "the folks on the sidelines, the parties of one faction or the other who create the trouble." Sympathizers on each side, he continued, accuse the *Times* of having "sold out to the other" and "very obviously we are in league with both God and the devil."

"I confess," continued Mr. Sulzberger, "to a vast sense of relief that I do not have to take sides with either Loyalist or Rebel. Each faction, however, reaches the separate conclusion that the *Times* has sold out to the other because we endeavor and succeed in getting the views of the rival camp. To them, it is an implication of dishonesty. . . . We have been subjected to such a vicious and deliberate attack on the part of Rebel sympathizers that I have almost come to believe that we did the bombing (of Guernica) ourselves. . . ."

The "vicious and deliberate attack on the part of Rebel sympathizers" was the minority Catholic attack, but so great

is the fear of this group in newspaper offices that the publishers of the most important paper in the country would not name names. There was no attack, vicious, deliberate, or otherwise from the friends of democratic Spain; there were protests, letters and an appeal to decency and reason. No one tried to get *Times* advertisers to stop advertising and no one threatened to boycott the paper.

From Mr. Sulzberger's statement, it would appear that so impartial a neutrality was observed that both sides became angry. But this is not quite accurate. The *Times* had been neutral and impartial at the first. Before the war began, Franco conspired with Germans and Italians for support—a secret covered by the false charge that the Soviets were planning an uprising for that autumn. Frank Kluckhohn of the *Times* did history a service by exposing the presence of Fascist aviators that August. The Italians had started for Spain on July 15, 1936, four days before the revolt began; the Germans started munitions shipping at an even earlier date. But when Catholic pressure bore on the *Times*, it failed later on to report the historical fact that Italian troops were in action in Spain, and had run away from the battlefield of Brihuega and Guadalajara. Matthews (and Hemingway and the rest, including my wife and myself) had been to that battlefield and had interviewed the bedraggled Italians who swore Mussolini had betrayed them and that Fascism was a fraud, but the *New York Times* cable desk cabled to Matthews, "STOP SENDING PROPAGANDA" and again "WHY DO YOU SAY THERE WERE ITALIANS AT GUADALAJARA WHEN CARNEY DENIES IT?" The censor in Madrid showed these cables to us before delivering them to Matthews. The entire press corps agreed that an attempt was being made by someone in New York to intimidate Matthews and to pervert the news.

Matthews took the heckling from the *Times'* pro-fascists

stolidly. He did not complain. But Fernsworth was incensed by the Catholic intrigue against him, and protested on every occasion. Toward the end of the war he wrote a cable in which he restated the difficulties of his position and to his great astonishment received a reply from Managing Editor James saying, "Resignation accepted." Fernsworth cabled again saying he had not resigned, but James insisted that the resignation was accepted. In this most curious manner, the *Times* was able to agree to the main pressure of the Catholic group. Matthews, arriving in New York after the war was over, refused to join the Newspaper Guild and refused to make public speeches about Spain, or speak or act in any way which might offend the bosses of the *Times*.

The attack of the Philadelphia hierarchy on the *Record*—and also on the affiliated Stern papers, the *New York Post*, *Camden Evening Courier* and *Camden Morning Post*—was even more vicious and cruder than the New York hierarchy's attack on most of the papers of the metropolis. Generally speaking, the smaller the city the greater the intimidation.

The four newspapers owned and controlled by J. David Stern, one of the few consistent supporters of the New Deal, naturally made an editorial choice in the Spanish conflict. "The struggle in Spain," said the *Record*, "is not a struggle between Communism and Fascism. Two groups are battling for supremacy. On one side are Republicans, Socialists, Communists, Syndicalists and Anarchists. They differ widely . . . but . . . each regards the *preservation* of Spanish democracy as the first and essential step. . . . On the other side are equally diverse elements, Carlist, Alfonsist and Juanist Monarchists, feudal land owners, Conservative Republicans, Fascists. They differ widely . . . but . . . each regards the *destruction* of Spanish democracy as the first and essential step. . . . Between these two groups believers in democracy can have

but one choice. Their sympathy must go to the forces supporting the Spanish Republic. . . ."

The Catholic hierarchy in Philadelphia was furious. It damned this editorial. It said the opposite was true. But we know now that this 1936 editorial spoke rightly, for in 1939 Franco, victorious, declared publicly against democracy and joined Hitler and Mussolini. Moreover, the Catholic hierarchy carried its political campaign for Franco and against the *Philadelphia Record* into the Church; it spoke from the pulpits and it distributed propaganda which was far from fair, just or truthful, inside the churches. The boycott of the newspaper was "urged in Catholic pulpits throughout the city."³ The official diocesan organ, *Catholic Standard & Times*, urging a boycott,⁴ said that the Spanish Popular Front consisted of "Communists, anarcho-syndicalists, and the more radical Socialists." By leaving out the majority of Republicans and Democrats, this official diocesan weekly was falsifying the truth.

No sooner had the priests preached and the Catholic press urged a boycott than the storm of letters of protest began shaking the *Record*. It was apparent from a casual reading that the majority of writers were not subscribers to the paper, had not read the editorial in question, did not know about what they were writing. They were simply blind followers of a fanatical idea. But they scared the editor and publisher. In addition, a pamphlet entitled "The *Philadelphia Record* weeps for Catholic Martyrs," published by an organization calling itself the League of American Democracy, was distributed at masses. It suggests that recipients show it to the advertising managers of department and other stores which advertise in the *Record*. This threat proved more effective than the ridiculous letters. The *Record* circulation had not

³ *Editor & Publisher*, August 22, 1936.

⁴ July 24, 1936.

been affected by the boycott, but the advertising thrust was more dangerous. The department stores, fearful of losing trade, withdrew or threatened to withdraw advertising from all the Philadelphia newspapers which favored the Loyalists, and inasmuch as department-store advertising is the most vulnerable spot in a newspaper, the Catholic threateners in this way were able to affect the entire press.

On August 10, 1936, Mr. Stern sent his humble apologies to Cardinal Dougherty. He called the archbishop of Philadelphia's attention to a second editorial "denouncing the Spanish government's action against the Catholic Church," adding that "we had hoped that it would offset any unfriendly impression created by the first editorial. . . . I very much regret this situation . . . I would very much appreciate your advice as to what I should or should not do in the matter."

Cardinal Dougherty, gracefully accepting the apology, pointed out that "the so-called Rebel, or Rightist party, in Spain was really battling for religious rights." This is not true. The Rebel, or Rightist, or Fascist or Franco side has officially announced that the Catholic Church will have a monopoly in Spain and no other religion will be tolerated. But it was not a matter of truth, justice, religious freedom; it was a matter of one side intimidating or controlling the press of a big city, and Philadelphia was won for the Church by fair means or foul.

In Baltimore, a Catholic city, the once famous and once liberal *Sun* papers have fallen into the muck of reaction; they are no longer among the dozen or less newspapers to which a defender of free journalism could point in answering the usual argument that the American press was commercial, venal, unenlightened, and the enemy of the masses of people. How much Catholic pressure has had to do with this change the reader can judge from two episodes.

In June, 1934, the well-known correspondent S. Miles Bouton, one of Mencken's men, wrote a series of articles. Of Hitler, whom he had known for years, he said: "It has seemed to me at times that there is a kinship between him and Ignatius Loyola. One finds in both men the same complete faith in their mission, the same readiness and determination to exercise their power with utter ruthlessness and brutality in order to carry out that mission. No consideration of personal profit or glory ever entered Loyola's mind, and I believe the same can be said of Hitler."

Although this statement appears harmless to non-Catholics, the words "ruthlessness and brutality" offended Catholics. Priests wrote letters of protest, Editor Paul Patterson answered them and published their protests. The incident seemed closed.

But then Archbishop Michael Joseph Curley returned to town. He rushed to the telephone and demanded a public apology from the *Sun* on terms which an independent newspaper could not accept. This means having failed, the archbishop used the *Catholic Review*, which had already reported the incident mildly, for threats of a boycott subtly worded:

"I am not saying that Catholics of this archdiocese should not buy the *Sun* and should not deal with its advertisers. I am saying, however, that our Catholic priests and people have no obligation in law or morals to buy the *Sun* or deal with *Sun* advertisers . . . We have stood enough of the insults of the *Sun*. . . . Let us have action."

To this subtlety the parish priests added the words: "Your pastor and the other priests of this parish have discontinued their subscriptions to the *Sun* papers. . . . I am notifying the firms with which I deal to send me statements in full. . . . I shall notify them it will be impossible for me to be guided by advertisements in papers which I do not read."

At that time it was said that the boycott was not effective.

However, four weeks later, Catholic laymen, friends of the *Sun*, called on the editor, and a statement was prepared regretting that "wounds" had been unintentionally caused by Mr. Bouton's words, which should have been deleted, but "no newspaper can demand of its writers that the view of any church as to a particular historical character shall govern. Otherwise, freedom of discussion and freedom of the press would disappear." Archbishop Curley angrily refused to accept this statement. Liberals at the time criticized the arrogant attitude and disregard for the legitimate freedom of expression of the secular newspapers by the leading Catholic spokesman of a large Catholic city.

Five years later, it was pointed out⁵ that this "incident allowed the *Sun* papers to feel painfully the weight of the church's hand. Though Mencken declares that subscriptions slumped very little and that only one minor account was dropped by a Catholic advertiser, other estimates set the circulation loss at 50,000" (out of 137,000). "Since 1934 the *Sun* has dealt tenderly with the Catholic Church. . . . It is reasonable to assume that the Curley attacks of 1934 may have affected *Sun* policy on the Spanish civil war. Shortly after the revolt started, a *Sun* man wrote an article in which he assessed the opposing forces greatly to the moral detriment of the rebels. From Catholic pulpits and from the columns of the *Catholic Review*, warning shots were fired across the *Sun's* bows; and a few days later the editorial staff received from the hand of John Owens (editor) a note signed by Paul Patterson stating that henceforth articles on Spain must be read by Mr. Owens (read Patterson) before going into print. This order, ending the *Sun* boast of free expression among its competent and informed staff, aroused a bitterness that has yet to vanish from the editorial rooms. *Sun* columns since that time have displayed pro-rebel sympathies, and Mr.

⁵ Willard R. Espy, *The Nation*, February 4, 1939.

Mencken has outdone Coughlin himself in excoriating the 'Barcelona convent-burners,' the scoundrels 'imported from Moscow' by 'Red Spain.'"

To the credit of the American press it must be said that although it surrendered to Catholic pressure it did so unwillingly. The *New York Sun*—the one big paper in the country which would have no difficulty whatever in switching to a Mussolini or Hitler regime in the United States since its policies, editorials, and handling of news are reactionary in the extreme—and Mr. Mencken of the *Baltimore Sun* were among the half dozen or less who supported Fascism in Spain. The majority of the newspapers merely published the news and editorials to suit the Catholic pressure group.

Westbrook Pegler,⁸ the unpredictable iconoclast of the columnar world, himself a pupil in his childhood in a Jesuit school, wrote for the Scripps-Howard syndicate a piece about Franco's murder of civilians. He said: "If I were a Spaniard who had seen Franco's missionary work among the children I might see him in hell but never in church." Mr. Howard's organization promptly suppressed this column—as it has suppressed numerous Pegler and Broun columns of an intelligent and liberal nature.

Dorothy Thompson, one of America's most influential and brilliant women, whom I have criticized severely because I believe she does not recognize and attack home Fascism as bravely as faraway Fascism, wrote that although Catholics opposed Supreme Court reorganization and other measures, "we don't hear the Catholic hierarchy protesting vigorously against what is happening in Jersey City. On the contrary, the Catholic hierarchy in Jersey City itself is collaborating very closely with Mayor Hague." She was equally indignant because "the Monsigneur of Jersey City who backs up Mayor

⁸Listed in the Catholic *Who's Who* until 1935.

Hague" threatened the chairman of a pro-Spain meeting. On another occasion she defied the Catholic hierarchy by a defense of Loyalist Spain and denunciation of the Fascist aviators who in Guernica, Madrid, Barcelona and other cities killed ten thousand or more innocent civilians. She was indifferent to the Catholic storm in papers such as the *Brooklyn Tablet*, and the *Herald Tribune* and its syndicate courageously enough did not crawl on their knees into the "power house" as other publishers have done. On the other hand, Miss Thompson's columns attacking Franco for his murderous actions were suppressed in the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, in Boston, and in many other cities where Catholic pressure groups work.

The comment column, "Speaking Out," by William Weer, appearing in the *Brooklyn Eagle* in 1938 and 1939, was supposed to be a free expression of liberal opinion, "as liberal as the President of the United States," and took the progressive side on such issues as W.P.A., unemployment, labor, the Nazi-Fascist menace, and, perhaps more often than other subjects, growing anti-Semitism in the United States. When that led to criticism of Father Coughlin, many letters of disapproval from Brooklyn Catholics reached the office.

When the columnist published a defense of the proposal to lift the Spanish embargo, the Rev. William J. Smith, S. J., took action. He wrote to the *Eagle* saying that while Weer may not be a Communist, "he thinks as one." This letter was published in the *Eagle*, and reprinted in the *Brooklyn Tablet*, with an introductory paragraph saying that Weer was shown up as "I. Kaufmann" who was "aiding Red Racket."

When succeeding letters came to the *Eagle* and were printed in its columns, the management informed the columnist that it could not afford to antagonize the Catholic readers, and therefore the column was discontinued in March 1939. The *Eagle*, all this time, had been trying to outma-

never the Newspaper Guild unit, whose chairman was the writer of the "Speaking Out" column, and the paper now accepted the Red tag which the Catholic letter writers had placed on the Guild head.

On small papers throughout the United States the Catholic pressure forced columnists out of their jobs. Those with a national following, the syndicated columnists, were able to fight back; nevertheless, the attack on them was, and is, tremendous, and everyone who still believes in not only a free but also an honest press must place Westbrook Pegler, Dorothy Thompson, Drew Pearson, Robert Allen and Heywood Broun on an honor roll for standing by their guns.

The campaign against the magazines was just as vicious. It would require a chapter, perhaps a book, to tell this story.

Advertisers are a scared crew, and notably the Jewish advertisers who are so afraid of Catholic anti-Semitism. When they receive a handful of letters from Catholic organizations telling them to quit advertising in a specified magazine, the Jewish liquor manufacturers get very wobbly in the knees.

This was strikingly the case of *Ken* and *Esquire*. One of *Esquire's* editors who was relieved of his department, has sent a protest to the League of American Writers in which he said:

I wish to appeal through the League to all fellow-members, urging them to wire or write their protest to Mr. David Smart, publisher of *Esquire* and *Ken*, over his concession to reactionary pressure in discontinuing my department of motion-picture criticism, *The Candid Cameraman*, which has been appearing in *Esquire* for more than four years.

. . . The issue is clearly the freedom of the press. This is the first instance, to my knowledge, where a systematic pressure campaign (for your information, organized chiefly by the Catholic Church) in terms of letters and postcards to advertisers in these magazines, has been utilized to suppress the free

expression of views by writers. Mr. Smart . . . is bowing to the express commands of certain advertisers, who in turn confront him with hundreds of postcards advising them to withdraw their advertising from magazines which employ writers like myself. . . . Naturally, if Mr. Smart is permitted to concede to this type of pressure, the same tactics may be used in the future to gang up on any writer. It takes only a few letters to impress an advertiser. . . .

Meyer Levin.

When the Catholic campaign against the American press had continued for about a year, *Editor & Publisher* went to its defense, whereupon the *Brooklyn Tablet* and similar unfair publications turned upon the unofficial spokesman of the publishers' association. Apparently these Catholic attackers were unaware that the editor of *Editor & Publisher* was himself a Catholic, and knew just how mean and unfair the reactionary Catholic weeklies were in handling the Spanish news. Mr. Robb replied, and to the point. He told the Catholic press, first of all, how ridiculous it was for it to shout in the same breath that the secular press was controlled by capitalists, big business, and presumably the Fascist element, and at the same time favored the Loyalists, who, according to the Catholics, were anticapitalist and communistic. Robb deplored the attack of the hierarchy on the *Philadelphia Record*, and added that "since then, every newspaper expression of sympathy with the Loyalist regime, and they have been few, has been hopped upon by Catholic editors as evidence of how newspapers are being duped by the Communist propagandists. . . . No one has succeeded in getting out of Spain any reliable information that has not appeared in the daily press. . . . The situation does not seem to be much different from that prevailing in Mexico a few years ago—when some hot-headed spokesmen for the Catholic Church would have liked to see Uncle Sam

step in and restore to the Church privileges it had lost in the radical revolt." Mr. Robb fears that continued pressure on the secular newspapers would create "a flareback in public opinion against obvious propaganda, or . . . kindle war fires again." He feels, with the majority of editors, that "the majority of Catholics share our belief that this war is only incidentally a religious war, and that religion is only one element, albeit a major element, in Spain's struggle for democracy. How long this tolerant view will stand in the race of incessant drumfire by the religious press to the contrary is a serious question. . . . They don't like to accept the news that German airmen bombed Guernica, a city as sacred to the religious Basque rebels as it is to the religious Madrid Loyalists. . . . The Catholic Church needs no advice on the virtues of patience—but it might not be amiss to mention its application to the present situation. . . ."

The *Brooklyn Tablet* continued the controversy even more bitterly, but the liberal Catholic press joined with Mr. Robb in his sentiments. However, the fact remained that the organized Catholic pressure on the lay press continued until the day Franco won. It was not a matter of continually apologizing to Catholic pressure organizations, or of publishing their letters, or always stating their propagandist viewpoint; the whole war became a nightmare to hundreds of American editors, and in order to get some peaceful sleep they suppressed thousands of items that might make trouble for their papers. If a thing was true, but sure to arouse the Catholics, it was suppressed. Franco news was played up, Loyalist news was played down. Buncombe, such as Carney sent the *Times*, was played up. An interview with a known army deserter became a front-page sensation in the press, but the arrival of a score of American veterans at Ellis Island, men with thrilling front-page stories, who were being detained by the government because of passport

troubles, was not news. Great Loyalist mass meetings were not news. Reporters from all the papers covering these events apologized to everyone in advance for the impending suppression. Catholic reporters as well as non-Catholics said fear of Catholic pressure was the reason.

Among the few American newspapers which did not give up their pro-Loyalist editorial stand when attacked by the Catholic pressure organization were: The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, the *Washington Post*, the *Portland Oregonian*, the *Dallas News* and the *Chicago Daily News*. They deserve a special place on the honor roll of fearless journalism. The *New York Herald Tribune* deserves special mention for not suppressing Miss Thompson, but its Paris edition (edited by Laurence Hills) not only ran an editorial favoring a Fascist Party in America but also supported Franco. The Franco propaganda bureau rented a whole floor in the Paris *Herald Tribune* building. This, of course, was a coincidence.

And so it happened that a small minority of a minority sect was able to control the news of a great war in a neutral press. Moreover, the Catholics, having perverted the free press in America, continued in their own press to denounce the secular press as unfair to Catholics. Their own press is well worth looking into.

CHAPTER 9

Catholic Pressure on the Movies

I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean.—Romans xiv: 14.

Obscenity is not a quality inherent in a book or picture, but solely and exclusively a contribution of the reading mind, and hence cannot be defined in terms of the qualities of a book or picture.—Theodore Schroeder.

THE Catholic Church in the United States went into action against what millions of persons considered "dirty" motion pictures many years ago. It disregarded completely the New Testament idea that uncleanness exists only in the minds of human beings, and could probably find nice texts to counteract Romans xiv: 14, since the Bible will provide excellent quotations for both sides of many questions. It also chose to disregard the viewpoint of psychologists. But that is of little concern to us all. The real question is, what has become of the instrument of censorship which the American public placed in the hands of the Catholics and what has become of the movies?

Certain critics of the Church, and notably the former Irish priest Leo H. Lehmann, believe that the Catholic hierarchy has always intended to monopolize the movies (and radio) because they are the most powerful medium of mass education in the world; and since there was no provision for censorship in Church regulations, the hier-

archy, through Catholic action, "set out carefully to plan steps of control." ¹

It is also a fact that Pope Pius XI was aware of the power which the movies exercise over the mass mind and was not averse to having this art made an instrument for propaganda for his Church. In his famous encyclical *Vigilante Cura*, issued July 2, 1936, at a time the Legion of Decency had gotten moral control of Hollywood, the Pope said, "the more marvelous is the progress of the motion picture art and industry, the more pernicious and deadly has it shown itself to morality, to religion, and even to the very decencies of human society." He recognized in the motion picture a valuable auxiliary to instruction and education; he knew it was one of the most potent means of influencing the people; and said that "the motion picture with its direct propaganda assumes a position of commanding influence."

The purpose of the encyclical was to point out the evil and to urge that the movies be made a force for good. The Pope stated that pictures "may be made to serve in a practical way to promote the extension of the kingdom of God upon earth," and to do this they should be "elevated to conformity with the aims of the Christian conscience." "The problem of the production of moral films would be solved radically if it were possible for us to have the production wholly inspired by the principles of Christian morality."

The Pope is thankful for the accomplishments of the Legion of Decency. The encyclical continues: "It is an exceedingly great comfort to us to note the outstanding success of the crusade. Because of your vigilance and because of the pressure which has been brought to bear by public opinion, the motion picture has shown improvement from the moral standpoint; crime and vice are portrayed less frequently; sin no longer is so openly approved or acclaimed;

¹ *New Republic*, November 23, 1938.

false ideals of life no longer are presented in so flagrant a manner to the impressionable minds of youth. . . ."

Finally, the Pope, having approved censorship, suggests that the bishops set up special reviewing boards in their own diocese, so that "they may even censor films which are admitted to the general list," or the Legion of Decency approved list. The purpose of all this censorship and control, according to the encyclical, is to "direct and regulate the greatest of arts in order that it may not find itself in continual conflict with Christian morality or even simply human morality based upon natural law."

All these are noble sentiments. The first objection, however, came from Protestant leaders and press, who denied the Pope's use of the word Christian when referring to that part of the Christian conscience and Christian world which he rules, namely, the Catholic part. However, for several years the Protestant sects stood by the Catholic in the business of dictating to the movie industry.

It has been pointed out that as early as 1927 certain producers made it a point to submit scripts to the National Catholic Welfare Conference for approval of ideas and scenes particularly important for Catholics, but it was not until 1930 that the movement now known as the Legion of Decency got under way. In that year a Production Code was written and presented to the Association of Motion Picture Producers by the Reverend Daniel A. Lord, S.J., and Martin Quigley, publisher of motion-picture magazines and now member of the New York Archdiocesan Council of the Legion. Impartial analyzers of the Code have remarked upon its Catholic and Jesuit viewpoint, its assumption, denied by philosophers and scientists, that everyone knows good from evil, what sin is, and what the "natural law" is, but that matter is not as important to the present writer as

its plain statement that the motion picture—once hailed as the second or third greatest force in the world for the enlightenment and improvement of mankind—should be turned into nothing but escapist entertainment. Here are the most amazing paragraphs in Father Lord's and Mr. Quigley's 1930 Production Code.²

1. No picture shall be produced which will lower the moral standards of those who see it. Hence the sympathy of the audience should never be thrown on the side of crime, wrongdoing, evil or sin.

2. Correct standards of life, subject only to the requirement of drama and entertainment, shall be presented.

3. Law, natural or human, shall not be ridiculed, nor shall sympathy be created for its violation.

II Sex. 7.

Sex hygiene and venereal diseases are not subject for motion pictures.

8. Scenes of actual child birth . . . are never to be presented.

Part II Reasons.

1. Theatrical motion pictures . . . are primarily to be regarded as entertainment. . . .

a. Entertainment which tends to improve the race, or at least to re-create and rebuild human beings exhausted with the realities of life. . . .

2. Motion pictures are very important as art. . . .

Art can be morally evil in its effect This is the case clearly enough with unclean art, indecent books, suggestive drama. The effect on the lives of men and women is obvious.

Note: It has often been argued that art in itself is unmoral, neither good nor bad. This is perhaps true of the thing which is music, painting, poetry, etc. But the thing is the product of some person's mind, and the intention of that mind was

² From *Decency in Motion Pictures*, by Martin Quigley.

either good or bad morally when it produced the thing. Besides, the thing has its effect upon those who come into contact with it. In both these ways, that is, as a product of a mind and as the cause of definite effects, it has a deep moral significance and an unmistakable moral quality.

X National Feelings.

2. The history, institutions, prominent people and citizenry of other nations shall be represented fairly.

"Law, natural or human, shall not be ridiculed," says the Code; things are either good or evil; and after ten centuries in which philosophers, artists and moralists have puzzled their great minds about what is art, Father Lord and Mr. Quigley end all controversy and write the law for the universe. Will Hays, "Csar" of Hollywood, had the code nicely printed and promulgated.

But nothing else happened. The Code was forgotten, the movies went along their usual way; there was, it is true, a lot of dirt and vulgarity, crime, seduction, robbery, divorce and marital infidelity which was offensive to many people, and a tremendous overwhelming amount of stupidity which was approved by most people.

On October 1, 1933, the Most Rev. Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate, Archbishop of Laodicea in Phrygia, addressing the Charities Convention in New York, in his capacity as representative of the Pope, summoned American Catholics to "a united and vigorous campaign for the purification of the screen, which has become a deadly menace to morals." Thus Pius XI may be credited with being the organizer of the present Legion of Decency. The papal delegate, according to another of its glorifiers, "put the torch of religious fervor to the dry tinder of public disgust. The fire spread rapidly."³

³ *Hollywood's Movie Commandments* by Olga J. Martin.

Within a few weeks the flames, which were roaring through the Protestant, Jewish and other churches, were gotten under control and directed against Hollywood by the annual conference of Catholic bishops, who, in Washington, D. C., named an episcopal committee on motion pictures with Archbishop John T. McNicholas of Cincinnati chairman.

It was a psychological moment. Many things in many countries are successful thanks to mass hysteria, and this was the time to organize everybody, Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans and others, into an army with banners. Within a short time 2,000,000 persons signed the Legion of Decency pledge—at the height of the wave there were 11,000,000—there were fifty Catholic diocesan organizations; in San Pedro 15,000 members of the Holy Name Society took the oath; 1,695,000 Catholics in Massachusetts were pledged, and the machinery of threats and boycott was put into action. The highly moral pledge of the Legion was:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

I condemn indecent and immoral motion pictures and those which glorify crime or criminals.

I promise to do all that I can to strengthen public opinion against the production of indecent and immoral films and unite with all who protest against them.

I acknowledge my obligation to form a right conscience about pictures that are dangerous to my moral life. As a member of the Legion of Decency, I pledge myself to remain away from them. I promise, further, to stay away altogether from places of amusement which show them as a matter of policy.

The boycott scared Hollywood. The industry capitulated before the attack became too general. Csar Will Hays announced that the Production Code, a dead letter for many

years, would become the moral guide, and on July 12, 1934, he appointed Joseph I. Breen, a Catholic, sometimes called "the Csarewitch," head of the Production Code Administration. Breen and Quigley went into conference with the Episcopal Committee and convinced Archbishop McNicholas and the Legion that the future was now safe. And it was.

Two years later, just after Pius XI had issued his famous movie encyclical, Will Hays was able to report to him that the movies were now above criticism—from the Legion—and to tell the press that he, Hays, "found himself in accord with the Pope's views on the morals of modern movies."⁴ Papal Marquis George MacDonald presented to the Pope letters from the heads of the movie industry, from the leaders of the American financial world, saying they accepted the papal encyclical.⁵ Archbishop McNicholas, asking for a renewal of his Legion pledge, said that motion pictures must "conform to the accepted and traditional morality upon which the home and civilization are founded."

Let us look at some examples of the traditional morality as interpreted by the Catholic censor in Hollywood and Catholic pressure in the movie theaters of the United States.

1. *Idiot's Delight*, by Robert Sherwood. One of the many Breen office notes addressed to the writers and producers of this movie reads: "Cut out: 'We the workers of the world, will save the human race.'" The phrase was objected to because it smelled of the Manifesto written by Karl Marx and ending with "Workers of the World Unite." I have seen the original note.

"Time and again the same studio has postponed production of *Idiot's Delight*. And each time production is held up by script trouble caused by censorship restrictions. The

⁴ Associated press report, Nov. 17, 1936.

⁵ *Catholic News*, Dec. 26, 1936.

character of the young Communist who denounces war will have to be eliminated along with other vital material before it can ever reach the screen." So Elizabeth Yeaman reports.⁶

2. *Three Comrades*, by Erich Maria Remarque. The screen play, embodying the original novel's main characters and ideas, was written by two of the best men in Hollywood, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Edward Paramore. But among those whom it displeased were the German Nazi consul and Mr. Breen, for apparently the same political reasons. When the producer was informed that the parts dealing with the morality of Nazi troopers and the inhumane treatment of the Jews would have to come out, he objected. Breen then suggested that the Nazi Storm Troopers be turned into Communist thugs. This would make the film a delight for all persons concerned and assure good sales abroad. But the producer threatened to tear up his contract, so a compromise was reached, in which all episodes in question were toned down to a minimum.⁷

3. *They Gave Him a Gun*. On January 23, 1938, the following order was sent out: ⁸

Feature: *They Gave Him a Gun*

Company: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer

Territory: Japan

Deletions: All scenes of kissing. Delete any footage which included the idea that war is not altogether glamorous and noble.

Joseph I. Breen

4. *The Lone Wolf Prowls*. "Cut all references inimical to Fascism," reads the order sent to the writers and producers of this film by the Breen office. I have seen the original.

⁶ *New Republic*, Oct. 5, 1938.

⁷ *Film Survey*, Feb. 1938.

⁸ Quoted by Leonard Lyons, *New York Post*, Feb. 4, 1938.

5. *It Can't Happen Here*. The most notorious case of censorship, of course, is that of the work of my former Vermont neighbor, Sinclair Lewis, and it also best illustrates the buncombe that accompanies the suppression of a story containing an idea.

Whatever else the book is, it is fundamentally a great indictment of reactionary dictatorship or Fascism. But it was not made because it was a blow at the Fascist Right.

Mr. Hays, of course, issued a statement denying he had given the order to suppress it. This was pure euphemism. Mr. Hays, in fact, had written to Louis B. Mayer of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer who had spent probably \$200,000 on the book: "We believe the story to be of so inflammatory a nature and so filled with dangerous material that only the greatest possible care will save it from being rejected on all sides." ("Mr. Hays cannot be called a liar," writes a *Times* reporter.)⁹

This letter is the most open giveaway of the czaristic mind. More than a hundred thousand persons have read the book and 200,000 have had an opportunity to do so in the reprint in the *New York Post*, and the only inflammatory things found in it, the only dangerous material, are an appeal to the reason and an appeal to the emotions against brutal and tyrannical dictatorship in America; an appeal such as Thomas Jefferson or Thomas Paine or Patrick Henry might have made against George III had they been novelists in their time.

The twin tyrannies, Germany and Italy, through government officials, immediately expressed their pleasure over the suppression of the Lewis book, the spokesman for the German Film Chamber adding he was certain that Sinclair Lewis was "a full-blooded Communist." But evidence of Hollywood Nazism soon came from Sidney Howard, president of the

⁹ *New York Times*, Magazine Section, March 29, 1936.

Dramatists Guild of the Author's League of America, who had been engaged to do the script. Mr. Howard exhibited the actual report of censor Breen and told of various interviews. In his report, Breen wrote he "would like to state that the observations contained hereinafter are based solely on the examination of the script from the standpoint of the production code and political censorship. Because of the danger suggested by this script from the standpoint of industry policy . . . we feel you have a serious undertaking on your hands in launching a picture of this nature at this time." In notes on the script, Breen cut the speech by the hero who combats Fascist dictatorship, who hopes there is enough "American spirit to get up a mob," and that dictatorship will be smashed by "a new American revolution."

Moreover, Mr. Howard was ordered not to use the word "Fascism" but he was permitted to let the dictator say, "Democracy is no good." If Adolf Hitler had done the censoring the result would have been the same. The elimination of the word Fascism, of course, would have made the film an attack on radical instead of reactionary dictatorship.

At one of the conferences over *It Can't Happen Here*, Mr. Howard declared he actually heard Mr. Breen say: "Things like freedom of speech and freedom of the press are all right to talk about, but do they belong on the screen?"¹⁰

When Mr. Howard exposed this political censorship—in favor of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy in this instance—the first man who rushed to Breen's defense was the man in whose mind the Legion of Decency was born: Martin Quigley. Here follows his amazing editorial¹¹ in which American democracy also gets a nice black eye:

This week's furore about the sacred cause of freedom and the screen, beginning with a statement from Mr. Sinclair Lewis

¹⁰ *New York Herald Tribune*, February 1936.

¹¹ *Motion Picture Herald*, Feb. 22, 1936.

to the effect that his novel, *It Can't Happen Here*, is being suppressed as motion picture material, will be reverberating around the editorial pages and in the international press for months to come. . . . Mr. Lewis sees Art, Expression, Thought, grabbed by the neck and throttled by a czar. . . . Human rights are crushed under heel. . . .

It is probable that Mr. Lewis, and many, many others, do not understand the status of the motion picture, in the eyes, or even minds, of his and our beloved and so infernally democratic public. . . .

It was not until the summer of 1939, after years of persecution of the Catholic Church by Hitler, and—perhaps more important—the complete loss of the Nazi market by the American producing companies—that MGM dusted off the Howard Mss. and went to work on the picture. Lucien Hubbard, the producer, said he intended to make the villain “the sort of guy who comes from New York’s foreign section.”

6. *St. Joan*, by Bernard Shaw. The controversy, which Mr. Shaw began with his letter to the *New York Times*, September 14, 1936, was considerably muddled by the Hays-Breen outfit and the spokesmen for the Legion of Decency which denied that any attempt at censorship had been made. Technically this answer was true—so far as the American censors are concerned. But this technicality does not change the Shavian contention, that *St. Joan* was censored—in Rome—and pressure exerted which made a Hollywood production impossible.

Briefly, the situation was this: Mr. Shaw had prepared a cinema version of his play for Elizabeth Bergner, one of the greatest actresses of our time, after the stage had presented it for eleven years. But when he found that he could not have the picture made, he blamed “the censorship of the Hays organization” which, he wrote, included “a body called Catholic Action, professing, on what authority I know not,

to be a Roman Catholic doctrinal censorship." Mr. Shaw was shocked because the play was "hailed by all instructed Catholics as a very unexpected first installment of justice to the Church from Protestant quarters. . . . I have certainly nothing to fear from Catholics who understand the conditions imposed on history by stage representation and are experts in Catholic history and teachings; but as hardly 1 per cent of Catholics can answer to this description I have everything to fear from any meddling amateur busybodies who do not know that the work of censorship requires any qualification beyond Catholic baptism. And the Catholic Action turns out to be a body of just such conceited amateurs."

Mr. Shaw then details the ridiculous requests made by the Roman Catholic Action, the scenes to be falsified, the words to be omitted, the ignorance of Catholic history and theology betrayed by the censors which, Shaw points out, would have put the Church in a very bad light if the changes were made. "I cannot accept the pretension of the Catholic Action to represent the Vatican," concludes Mr. Shaw. "It has neither the knowledge nor the manners to sustain such a part. . . . It has no legal authority to enforce its vetoes. Yet it has brought all the Hollywood financiers and corporations to their knees. . . . I make all this public because I believe very few inhabitants of the United States, Catholic or Protestant, lay or secular, have the least suspicion that an irresponsible Catholic society has assumed public control of their artistic recreations."

Hollywood replied that no script had been submitted. Father Francis X. Talbot, editor of *America*, said, "some individual in Rome," connected with Catholic Action, not the organization itself, had criticized the scenario. He added that Shaw had written his protest to prepare "for a box office success." This insinuation angered the Great Bernard who

made a more explicit and damaging statement. "All I know," he said, "is that the film business in America is in the grip of a Catholic censorship strong enough to intimidate an English producer into submitting a play for its approval. . . . I was stopped but I could not tell exactly what stopped me. I was like a man run over by an automobile without a number. I could decipher the words 'Azione Cattolica.' . . . When I raised a hue and cry in the United States I was assured I had not been run over at all and was only trying to advertise myself; that there was no such thing as a Catholic Action; that the Catholic Action censorial arm in the United States was the Catholic Legion of Decency . . . that Mr. Breen was in Panama. . . ." Mr. Shaw regretted that producer Paul Czinner had not gone directly to the Pope for permission because "he would have got his certificate with a blessing for me as well."

7. *Juarez*, by John Huston, A. McKenzie and W. Reinhardt. This film betrays another feature of Legion of Decency activity. The organization did not put the movie on its prohibited list, but in its weekly bulletin stated: "Reviewers requested that attention be drawn to the fact that the motion picture 'Juarez' is not to be considered as uniformly reliable in its historical references."

In fact, this statement is true, but not in the sense the Legion intends it. I do not know what unimportant anachronisms occur, or what liberties the producers have taken with history, but it is obvious that the most important subject, next to the struggle for Mexican liberty, and a fundamental part of that struggle, was the stand of the Catholic Church in Mexico, and that part was left out in order not to offend the Legion and stir it up to a boycott. One reviewer has noted this fact. "The picture," writes Archer Winsten, "perpetrates one outstanding but perfectly comprehensible distortion of history. There is no mention of

the vital role of the Mexican Catholic Church on the side of the conservatives and the rich. Against the Church Juarez and Lerdo de Tejada promulgated their severest laws. The struggle between Church and State in Mexico is one of the longest and bitterest in modern history." But it is not mentioned on the screen.

8. *Blockade*, by John Howard Lawson. This film presents a fourth form of Catholic pressure. When Walter Wanger presented the script to Breen, the Catholic censor not only passed it but also personally congratulated the producer on the excellence of the idea and the story. The scene is Spain, and there is a war, but from the beginning no identification was made of the two sides. Therefore, in attempting to stop the making of the picture and the boycott which followed, the Catholic zealots betrayed themselves completely, for they were protesting a film which showed a young man (Henry Fonda) protesting the killing of children by bombers (unnamed) and finally making one of the greatest speeches to the audience ever heard in a movie:

You go on leave and find peace—away from the front—but where would you find it? The front is everywhere. Our country has turned into a battlefield—there's no safety for old people and children—women can't keep their houses—they can't be safe in their own fields—the churches and schools and hospitals are targets! It's not war—war is between soldiers—this is murder of innocent people! Stop the murder of innocent people! The world can stop it! Where is the conscience of the world?

That was all there was in *Blockade*. And yet Catholic pickets marched in front of movies and Catholics threatened to boycott forever those houses which booked the film. The pickets and boycotters therefore identified themselves with the Fascists, the bombers of women and children, the "other

side," while those who produced and supported *Blockade* identified themselves with the pro-peace elements, the humanitarians, the people with a conscience.

As Winchell Taylor pointed out,¹² Catholic pressure tried to prevent the making of the film and Catholics tried to get Wanger's Catholic financial backers to put the screws on this movie. "Catholic pressure was exerted on W. G. Van Schmus, Catholic managing director of Radio City Music Hall to prevent him from booking the film. . . . *The Hollywood Reporter* ran a front-page story about the film's 'poor' opening . . . giving the day's receipts as \$8,500. The correct figures for that day were \$10,600. The *Motion Picture Daily* and *Motion Picture Herald*, edited and published by Martin Quigley, a Catholic, launched a series of attacks on *Blockade*." Catholic pickets at Radio City called the film "war propaganda." In Flint, Michigan, bookings were canceled. The second run in Buffalo was called off. In Boston the League of Catholic Women and the Knights of Columbus almost got Mayor Tobin to ban the picture. It was released with deletions. The Catholic organizations contended that the movie was "communistic," and in Kansas City they were more specific and asked that the concluding speech be eliminated. In Providence the commissioner of licenses refused a permit for a second run. The Rev. Curran, the *Brooklyn Tablet*, the *Catholic News* (New York), and even *The Catholic Worker* attacked *Blockade*. The *Worker*, which is usually iconoclastic when hysterical censor and pressure movements get under way, actually sent its own editors as pickets in this instance. They said the film was propaganda. *America* said: "'Blockade' does not violate the moral code . . . and hence is not strictly within the scope of the Legion of Decency. But 'Blockade' does violate an understanding with the public: namely, motion pictures must not be used

¹² *The Nation*, July 9, 1938.

as propagandistic mediums. . . . This picture is produced by Communists, Leftists, Liberals and radicals. . . ."

The *Blockade* episode was important because it was a test case. If Catholic pressure had been successful and the picture boycotted, the timid producers of Hollywood would drop plans for *Exiles*, *Personal History*, *Idiot's Delight*, and other films which forsook the field of stupid "pure entertainment" for the more dangerous lands of intelligent controversy.

Walter Wanger, who had defied all intimidations in producing *Blockade*, said: "The motion picture is a high estate and a very important pillar in the Democratic structure we are so proud to live under. It must be protected." He alleged the campaign against *Blockade* was waged "to prevent a flood of stronger and stronger films," and urged Hollywood to fight back.

The Catholic policy of making an issue out of a film which had no question of faith or morals, but dealt with the facts of a war, had a repercussion in non-Catholic circles. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, notified all their chapters throughout America to support and publicize the film. The Department of Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America sent letters to its affiliates in key cities to fight against attempts at suppression. The American Labor Party—which has strong Catholic labor support—sent out literature favoring *Blockade* to a thousand branches. Others who helped were: the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Church; the Girls Friendly Society of the U.S.A.; Epworth League; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church; American League and the North American Committee's various committees to aid Spain; unions representing

teachers, newspaper, fur, textile, auto, rubber, steel, mine, musicians and transport workers. The American Civil Liberties Union went into action wherever the film was in danger of suppression.

Counter pressure in Omaha defeated the Knights of Columbus attempt to ban the film. The American Newspaper Guild helped in many cities. The United Automobile Workers helped get the film a showing in Detroit after Father Luther, dean of the University of Detroit, threatened a boycott, pickets, an injunction, and "to bring down the wrath of God upon the management." Three hundred delegates from sixty California religious, fraternal, social, labor and war veteran organizations met as a result of the Catholic attack, and pledged unanimous support to *Blockade* and the protection of the freedom of the screen.

In many cities the scandal caused by Catholic pressure resulted in the picture's doing tremendous business. In many smaller cities, however, the Knights of Columbus, Holy Name Societies, and other organizations were able to suppress the picture. But altogether it can be said fairly that the fight made for and against *Blockade* hurt the Catholic Church and aroused a great body of American opinion to the danger of censorship and pressure by one minority group.

9. *The Informer*, from the novel of Liam O'Flaherty. This film not only won the 1935 award as outstanding movie of the year, but also is still regarded as one of the greatest films ever made. It was banned by the Chicago branch of the Legion of Decency. Richard Watts, Jr., one of our outstanding movie and drama critics, calls attention of "those who believe that the Legion of Decency has done great things for the cinema" to the fact the Chicago branch called *The Informer* immoral and indecent and not fit to be seen by clean-living Americans." Incidentally, Watts de-

clares that the rumor that this picture was not an economic as well as artistic success is untrue. It made big money despite being good art.

10. *Birth of a Baby*, sponsored by the American Committee on Maternal Welfare, produced by Jack Skirball of Educational Films, under the direction of A. E. Christie, from a scenario written by Dr. Fred L. Adair and Dr. Walter Cox, aided by Arthur Jarrett and Burke Symon; filmed in the Cornell Medical Center; approved by more than 4,000 doctors at the American Medical Association convention in 1937.

"This production has considerable merit from the medical, educational, social and technical points of view," said a National Legion of Decency second report on *Birth of a Baby*. "Intrinsically, the film is moral in theme. . . ." Nevertheless, the picture was held "unsuited for entertainment and inappropriate for general theatrical exhibition."

Here is an instance where the Legion was entitled to its opinion—and a majority of persons, notably a majority of doctors, scientists, social and intellectual leaders, were entitled to a contrary opinion. The Legion was entitled to advise its members not to go to the theater, and the medical profession and the secular press was entitled to advise its readers to look at the film. The point that interests us here, however, is the way the Catholic Church—with of course the usual but unfortunately few exceptions—conducted its campaign to prevent the majority from doing what it pleased. The reader must understand that whereas the campaign against the film may have been conducted ethically and decently in New York or other big cities, strange and unusual things happened in hundreds of towns and villages.

In the general war upon the picture, the Church and its Knights of Columbus and other action groups used four methods: they sent delegations to the city fathers everywhere

insisting that the council officially ban the showing; if the first and most important method failed, the delegations intimidated exhibitors, threatening not only a boycott pending the showing of the "Birth" but also a perpetual boycott which would ruin the exhibitor's business; archbishops and priests not only denounced the picture from the pulpit but also actually forbade Catholics to see it; and finally, the Catholic press (that "repository of truth") wrote editorials calling the picture "obscene, vicious and immoral," although the Legion of Decency did nothing of the kind, and banned it only because "adequate and satisfactory audience control is very difficult to obtain in theatrical exhibitions."

In Iowa, for example, the Catholic pressure resulted in the cancellation of contracts in twelve towns; in Minnesota in seven towns, and so on through the Middle West.

A bitter fight was waged in Ohio, and as usual the big cities saw the film whereas the Church was able to get it suppressed in the small towns. One exception was New Philadelphia, where the city administration decided to let the law take its course, although Rev. T. F. Freese of the Nazarene Church advised the chief of police to violate the law. In this town the local theater invited the Knights of Columbus and a committee from the Catholic church to see a preview before attending their meeting with the city council. The Nazarene Church resolution asking for a ban called the picture "indecent, immoral, unnecessary, vicious, degrading and a breeder of the greater evils in the future that will tend to open the way for performances that will further degrade and pollute the atmosphere of the social life of our city to a level of rottenness that will imperil the safety of our people." (Anyone who doubts that such English can be written nowadays should get the *Daily Reporter*, Dover, Ohio, June 28, 1938, for the full text of this remarkable document.)

But Councilman Howard asked if anyone had seen the picture.

A "deep silence" greeted this question, the press reported.

Mayor A. H. Williams quoted the law: there was no means of suppressing pictures; a petition could be sent to the court.

Whereupon (says the *Daily Reporter*), the Rev. Mr. Freese suggested that the picture be stopped regardless of the law. But Police Chief Gintz refused to break the law.

In Caldwell, Ohio, the Rev. Fr. Louis B. Preston, who signs himself "chairman, South Eastern Ohio Catholic Action, Division of Legion of Decency," wrote as follows to Mrs. O. E. DeLong of the Toledo Motion Picture Council:

I notice in the . . . *Cambridge Jeffersonian* . . . that said picture received the indorsement of the above named council. . . . I want to tell you that if you silly women don't wake up and get wise to yourselves, you will have contributed a mighty share in bringing about the downfall and ruin of our beloved country. Who and what power is behind this picture? I wager a hundred to one you can't answer this question. . . .

The only organizations that have stood behind this picture are the ones tinctured with Communism. And who are they? The Young Women's Christian Association, many ministers and bishops of the Protestant Church, all of them birth-prevention maniacs and victims of every heretical wind that blows.

Since when did Jesus Christ commission the Toledo Motion Picture Council, the Y. W. C. A., the Cleveland Women's Club, the *Columbus Citizen* and the *Ohio State Journal* to be the teacher of Faith and Morals? . . .

There were also many scurrilous letters.

The Hearst press was for suppression.

On the other hand, Catholic as well as Protestant doctors

and leaders endorsed the film. Among endorsers mentioned in Dr. Adair's letter to *The Advocate*, official organ of the Cincinnati Knights of Columbus, are: Surgeon General Parran, Dr. Joseph Crotty of Cincinnati, who had, as a Catholic, opposed the viewpoints of *The Advocate* and Bishop Schrembs and other Cincinnati Catholics who had attacked the film without having seen it; Dr. James Hayes, president of the Minnesota State Medical Society, Dr. W. A. O'Brien of the University of Minnesota. Catholic support was dignified and intelligent. The same cannot be said for the opposition.

The foregoing ten examples of Catholic pressure against films which are among the most important and best so far produced by Hollywood, can be classified under four headings:

Prevention: (*It Can't Happen Here*, *St. Joan*.)

Censorship: (*Idiot's Delight*.)

Distortion: (*Juarez*.)

Intimidation: (*Blockade*, *Birth of a Baby*.)

In many instances two or more of the four methods were used for the same movie. It is hardly necessary to point out that inasmuch as every script is submitted to the Breen office, every film, including those which the Legion of Decency later classifies as "Unobjectionable for General Patronage; Unobjectionable for Adults; Objectionable in Part; and Condemned," has already been through a censorship. But all the censorships and pressures are nothing compared to that unseen and unspoken one which for decades has frightened the producers of films away from pictures with intelligent ideas, with a social content, with controversial but important problems. "Producers," said the *Times* in its article on

Breen, "are now inclined to ask before they buy. . . . If there is any element that presents a problem . . . a copy is rushed to Mr. Breen." And if Mr. Breen refuses his seal, the picture cannot be shown in any house subscribing to the movie code, which means that virtually every first-class cinema cathedral in America will not show it, and it cannot possibly make the big money. Breen, the *Times* adds, in two years, "has written more sequences unaided, probably, than any one writer in the studios." He has in fact written such considerable parts of certain films that he has several times been asked to permit a credit line for himself on the finished product. He has refused modestly. But nevertheless he has exercised a control over the movies which the major part of the world has seen for many years, as the Pope has exercised over the faith and morals of the Catholic population. Certainly no one man, no matter how sincere and intelligent, should be delegated such power.

For many years, persons who had hoped that the motion picture would eventually emerge from its I.Q. 12 rating and betray a gleam of post-adolescent intelligence, have been pessimistic about the future of this great popular art. They have been told that in order to reach the masses one has to write down to the level of the public-school mind, that the popular newspapers with their comic strips, the most popular radio programs, and the movies are in the same drifting downstream boat.

On the other hand, there is a new voice, recently raised, which accuses the Legion of Decency and the Breen Production code control with making the movies what most of them are: a low form of entertainment. The new voice charges those in control of making "pure entertainment" the dictum for the motion picture because they could direct such films, whereas the moment intelligence and controversy

entered the screen, their control would be challenged, and might be broken.

That the film is intended to be purely entertainment is admitted by many persons who speak authoritatively. For example, Father McClafferty of the Legion. When a group representing the sponsors and makers of the *Birth of a Baby* film called upon him with a request that he see the picture before condemning it, and that he consult the Catholic clergy, including the bishop, the mayor, doctors and leading citizens in Minneapolis, he replied that all this was not necessary, inasmuch as his reviewers, who had seen the film, found it "contrary to Catholic morality." He was, however, persuaded to see the film himself, but he uttered this warning: "The fundamental concept of the Church on the place of the cinema in American life is diametrically opposed to that of the producers of the *Birth of a Baby*. You say and believe with all sincerity the cinema can and should produce educational films, and you state that this picture is such a film. But the official position of the Catholic Church (now mind you, this is not my ruling, but that of the Church) on the place of the cinema in American life is that the cinema should be for entertainment, escape, and not for education."

The same opinion has been expressed by Martin Quigley and his *Motion Picture Herald* several times. When Films for Democracy was organized late in 1938 "for the purpose of utilizing the powerful force of the American screen to awaken a new pride and a new love for democracy in the people of the United States at a time when its enemies are actively engaged in undermining the principles upon which this republic was founded," certain Catholic reactionary papers and Quigley attacked it. The *Catholic News* asked, "Is it a cloak for Communism?" and inferred that it was. Quigley accused the new organization of "muscling-in on

the amusement screen with propaganda" and his opposition to anything that would change films from "a door into a world of charm, beauty, fantasy, romance and vicarious adventure . . . escape from the hates, hurts and fears of the world-as-it-is." Quigley attacks the defenders of *Blockade* and the important scholars and leaders who sponsor Films for Democracy. *Boxoffice*, leading film journal, under the liberal editorship of Maurice Kann, not only defended the idea of Films for Democracy and films of intelligence, but also pointed out that the serious business situation of 1938-9 in the movie industry was partly due to audiences quitting the cinema palaces because of the stale entertainment—and lack of ideas—offered them.

In the Hays-Breen organization the world of ideas has always been frowned upon. In the 1938 report of the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, a chapter is devoted to "Propaganda has no place on the entertainment screen," the word propaganda apparently meaning liberal ideas, inasmuch as the control office passed numerous antiradical and pro-Nazi and pro-Fascist films in the course of its history, and killed many displeasing to Hitler and Mussolini. The Breen-Hays office, the Legion of Decency, Quigley, Father McClafferty, and the Jewish and Protestant producers of the movies, and even the great majority of movie-goers, may prefer to keep the movies out of the realm of thought, but it is significant that there is a rebellion arising throughout the country. *Recent Social Trends* reported to President Hoover that "although the motion picture is primarily an agency of amusement, it is no less important as an influence in shaping attitudes and social values." Whether the censors want it or not, and despite all they can do to suppress and distort, the movies have been a tremendous influence.

The chief complaint against them in the past has been that Breen and the Legion of Decency have emasculated

them. They have produced never-never land, instead of an intelligent world. But much more important is the growing realization that those who control the movies have made a political and social instrument out of them—a weapon against democratic and progressive ideas and ideals.

A complete indictment of the Legion has been made by Associated Film Audiences.¹³ The object of the organization is to organize filmgoers for the support of films upholding American democracy, civil liberties, the Bill of Rights and to fight Fascist trends, attacks on labor, and films which are anti-Liberal and anti-Progressive. Since its report is the most comprehensive on the subject, I am quoting it in detail.

Today (it begins) the censors are not concerned with a cleanup on moral grounds. That has been accomplished. . . . Today it is politics that disturbs the censors. Can films be made about the Fascist invaders of Spain, China and Austria? Can totalitarian persecution of racial and religious minorities, including Catholics, be made into drama for the screen? The Catholic Legion of Decency says "NO."

The growing battle on political grounds between minority censors and the American people is of tremendous importance to America today; and not less to the outside world, for which Hollywood is the leading film producer. Catholic control of Hollywood movies, therefore, would mean censorship by the Roman Church of what most of the world sees on the screen. . . .

In the Legion, the church has the setup for developing world-wide control of movies. In America, development of this control has progressed to an alarming degree, based as it is on the potential co-operation of 21,500,000 Catholics—the nation's largest minority group—and carried out through various closely affiliated organizations, such as the Knights of Columbus, National Catholic Truth Society, Holy Name

¹³ In its August, 1938, issue of *Film Survey*. The Association's offices are at 250 West 57th Street, New York City. Persons interested in intelligent movies should join this organization.

Society, International Federation of Catholic Alumnae, as well as the Catholic press. . . .

It is recognized that the Legion has had much influence in purging movies of smut, which producers tried to pass off as "entertainment." After that has been said, and due credit given, it must be considered that the interpretation of morality and politics which guides the Legion can be wholly acceptable only to members of the Catholic Church, and not even to all Catholic laymen. . . .

One of the firmest Catholic doctrines is opposition to divorce and to birth control. In this opposition the Legion represents a minority in a country whose citizens have, through many state legislatures, indicated a liberal and enlightened view toward these problems. The Legion continues, nevertheless, to condemn films which treat divorce and birth control as possible solutions to marital difficulties. It thereby adversely influences production of films using these themes. On the Legion's objectionable list, ostensibly because "divorce and remarriage are condoned" in the plot development of these pictures, are such universally acclaimed films as, "Dodsworth," "Rembrandt," "Hands Across the Table," "Things to Come." Even less pretentious pictures like "Sinners in Paradise," "Bluebeard's Eighth Wife," "The Baroness and the Butler," and "Anna Karenina" are likewise frowned upon because they do not adhere to the Catholic conception of marriage.

To what kind of picture, then, does the Legion give blessing? Study of its ratings reveals that among pictures "unobjectionable" for general patronage are those which are pro-war, which glorify militarism, are anti-Negro and detrimental to labor. Such outbursts as "Born to Glory," "Stand Up and Cheer," "Annapolis Salute," "Riff-Raff," "Espionage," "Join the Marines," "Professional Soldier," the anti-Negro "Prisoner of Shark Island," and the jingoistic "World in Revolt" are placed in the (unobjectionable) Class A category. . . .

Strikingly fine pictures, like "Black Legion," "Dead End," "They Won't Forget," and "The Road Back," an anti-war film, are for adults only. . . . Such blood-and-thunder creations

as "Armored Car," "Blazing Justice," etc., are, according to Legion classifications, wholesome for children.

Of 120 Nazi pictures reviewed from February 1936 to November 1937 none is condemned. Only six are "not acceptable in part." Among those passed was "Friesennot," one of the most reactionary pictures ever shown here and hurriedly withdrawn . . . after mass protests against its vicious anti-Semitic propaganda. Twenty pictures from Fascist Italy were reviewed during the same period. Not one failed to win the Legion's seal of purity. It is Legion policy not to review Russian films, though movie critics of the world have praised the artistic film achievements of the Soviet. Not even Russian films of non-political content, popular hits like "Gypsies," "Beethoven Concerto," "Son of Mongolia," "Peter the First," "Song of Happiness," are worthy of the Legion's attention. It has reviewed upward of 250 foreign films, including obscure importations in Japanese, Chinese and Slovak; but has seen fit to ignore Paul Strand's Mexican film, "The Wave." This dealt in sympathetic light with the economic struggles of peon fishermen, was widely shown in America as one of the finest films ever made. Directly but cautiously, the Legion shows its hand in the confidential statements it distributes to editors and subscribers explaining its film ratings. . . .

Why, on one hand, does the Legion pass pro-war, militaristic and Fascist films and, on the other, criticize all liberal and progressive treatments? Why is "World in Revolt," which discredited progressive movements by labeling them revolutions, acceptable and the humanitarianism of "Blockade" condemned?

No longer is the Legion of Decency the mere watchdog of decency. It is the self-appointed censor of a nation's progressive ideals. It brings to the movie the standard of narrow suppression, which from time immemorial has fought and blocked all forms of civilized progress.

A similar indictment of not only Hollywood censorship but also that of the seven states which have their own addi-

tional boards, is made in the December 1, 1938, report of the American Civil Liberties Union. It emphasizes the known fact, that the announced purpose of all censors, the elimination of immorality or vice, the protection of youth from unduly suggestive representations of sex and crime, the discouragement of vicious, loose or immoral behavior, is never accomplished; that investigation shows that lurid exhibitions of vice and crime may be found, that the Hollywood and state boards fail to improve the movies. "Not only have liberal, labor and radical themes been censored, but even news films thought to be 'offensive to a friendly nation' have been cut out," the report shows. The censors have no legal justification for judging films on a political basis, but they do. The union is opposed to censorship *in toto*, and especially precensorship, which is the Hollywood idea.

Hollywood's movie morals dictatorship was given to Breen and the Legion of Decency became the decisive power in the industry because, during a somewhat hysterical campaign against "dirty" pictures, Protestants, Jews and others joined in the Catholic crusade. But there are indications that the Protestants are no longer willing to be a part of it. According to the *Christian Century*, the Legion has never been willing to co-operate with any non-Catholic agency, "or even to recognize the existence of such." All that outsiders were allowed to do was to "stand aside and applaud."

"The guardianship of public morals," said the *Christian Century*,¹⁴ "is a task in which Protestants, Roman Catholics and Jews may properly unite their efforts. But it is not a task that Protestants and Jews may properly and safely leave to the Roman Catholics. . . . There are at least three reasons . . . first, because it is as much theirs as anyone's; second, because the Roman Catholic conception of morality is not identical with the Protestant or Jewish; third, because a

¹⁴ July 29, 1936.

Catholic campaign for 'decency' inevitably works around to a program of censorship under Catholic control going far beyond the requirements of mere decency. . . ."

The *Christian Century* concludes that "a Catholic campaign for 'decency' can confidently be expected to become a system of censorship in the interest of the Roman Catholic Church and everything that it stands for. To say this is not 'Pope-baiting.' The same thing could doubtless be said of a Methodist or a Presbyterian campaign for decency. . . ."

Since the foregoing was written, numerous non-Catholic church publications have advocated a board of censorship in which other sects will have equal power with that of the Catholic Church; a few have argued against all censorship.

But most important of all has been the awakening of Hollywood producers. In 1939 all the reports were good. Important scripts, like Sinclair Lewis' *It Can't Happen Here* were being dusted off; *Personal History*, by Vincent Sheean was scheduled again; *Confessions of a Nazi Spy* was a big audience and money success; Chaplin's *The Dictator* was being produced. Hitler and Mussolini were being defied. (It is true that the markets of Italy, Germany, Japan, and Spain, the dictator countries, were either lost or moneyless.) Members of the Screenwriters Guild who had once been on the producers' blacklist, and writers and stars against whom the Knights of Columbus and other organizations had passed resolutions were at work on progressive films, and the pro-Fascists and reactionaries were no longer in complete control of the political content of the movies. Unfortunately there were few Catholic voices raised against the reactionary and pro-Fascist forces.

PART III

THE VATICAN AND THE WORLD

CHAPTER 10

The Fascist Internationale

Christianity and Fascism are absolute antipodes. The choice . . . is . . . Christ or Mussolini.—*Il Piccolo*.

TOLERANT, open-minded, liberal American non-Catholics—and perhaps many Catholics of the same mental stratum—have found it more and more difficult recently to understand the politics and policies of the most powerful of all Internationales, the Catholic hierarchy. This is because of the paradoxes, inconsistencies and, at times, either the stupidity or incredible callousness of some of its representatives who have condoned the murder of civilians, propagandized for war and violated what the world believes to be the accepted ethics of Christianity. As, for example, Father Joseph F. Thorning, S.J., defending the massacres at Barcelona on the ground that “the day of the noncombatant has passed.”

The Spanish War is the direct cause of a great deal of the present suspicion, both in America and in Europe, that the Vatican co-operates with the Fascist axis. The evidence is overwhelming that Franco is a clerico-Fascist, that the entire uprising and its political direction for years was purely Fascist, and largely in the control of Hitler and Mussolini; nevertheless the Catholic press, and Catholic prelates, including cardinals, either misled the public or kept a guilty silence. But when the war ended and the new Pope, Pius

XII, blessed the aviators and soldiers who had committed brutal and atrocious murders, who had killed Catholic women and Catholic children intentionally, following the new Nazi German war technique of terrorizing civilian populations in a totalitarian war, then many Catholics as well as most non-Catholics were forced to the conclusion that the Vatican had married itself to the ultimate (and most violent) form of reaction, namely, Fascism.

In the non-Catholic countries there has been, up to now, little suspicion of a Church relationship with Fascism, and in 1929, when Mussolini and the Pope signed the Lateran Treaties, much doubt was expressed whether they really freed the "prisoner of the Vatican," whether the Pope really was the enemy of Fascism, whether as a purely opportunistic policy the Church, in Italy, at least, would have to do what Mussolini wanted.

Even in 1936, when many bishops and at least one cardinal blessed the Black Shirts, who were about to loose poison gas on innocent unarmed Ethiopian Christians, bomb Red Cross hospitals, massacre civilians, and commit proved atrocities, few Americans accused the Catholic Church of playing the Fascist game, although Britons, closer to European affairs and anti-clerical nations generally, did attack the Church policy.

Since July 1936, Catholic actions in European politics, in American politics, in labor struggles everywhere, in conflicts between superpatriots and Liberals, in the exercise of arbitrary censorship, in the terrific use of mass pressure against progressive and liberal ideas and movements, in intimidation of magazines and newspapers, in boycotts, in threats uttered from the pulpits, have resulted not merely in considerable questioning of policies among Catholics but also in growing resentment among non-Catholics in America. These are facts which cannot be denied.

Where there is no resentment there is at least open-minded wonder how and why this Church, founded to free the poor and oppressed and still appealing in all lands largely to the exploited, the lower classes, the proletariat, should make it its policy—in Mexico, in Italy, in Austria, to some extent in America and most notoriously in Spain—to co-operate with dictators, Bourbons, economic royalists, the men of big business, the aristocracy, the militarists—in short, the forces that are the enemies of labor and of the progressive liberation of the people. Catholic apologists may deny there is a legitimate cause for either wonder or resentment, but the thunder of the cannon of that notable Catholic leader, Dollfuss, against the homes and bodies of Vienna workmen will be heard a long time in history. And who can deny that all the labor-union members in Spain (more than 5,000,000, largely Catholics) were fighting that same General Franco whom Cardinal Goma calls a "soldier of Christ," the "leader of a Christian crusade," whom the Pope has blessed and whom labor throughout the world has cursed?

In all lands the record appears to justify the charge which Catholic notables themselves have discovered: that their Church is united with Fascism. I say appears, because it is my intention, after reviewing the record, to explain Vatican policy and to show that there is also an opposition movement of importance.

THE SPANISH TRAGEDY

The Catholic Church's policy is to support the *status quo* and the government in power. It opposed the Spanish revolution which began April 12, 1931, when four million men voted against monarchy and Zamora came out of jail to ask Alfonso to go into exile. Much laughter and little bloodshed followed. But Dictator De Rivera's program, "the Na-

tion, the Monarchy, the Church" had collapsed, and because the hierarchy had appealed to the masses to vote against the Republic, the Church fell with the monarchy.

Cardinal Pedro Segura y Saenz, archbishop of Toledo and primate of Spain, had made a wrong guess. The archbishop of Valencia, Valladolid and Sigüenza, the bishops of Madrid and other prelates openly mixed in politics, supporting the Fascist dictatorship. The 1931 election returns could not be falsified, as was done in the past; the people overwhelmingly were against the continuance of domination by monarchy and Church. Cardinal Segura then issued a pastoral letter calling the popular victory the triumph of the "enemies of the kingdom of Jesus Christ." When President Zamora heard that the cardinal had said in the pulpit of Toledo Cathedral, "May the Republic be cursed," he sent a mild rebuke.

Spain declared itself a workers' Republic. "The Church was forbidden to take part in education; it was forbidden to take part in trade; it was deprived of the state grant for priests' stipends. But the Religious Orders were not expelled from Spain and most of them continued their work unmolested. Even the Jesuits, who were most generally loathed, were not seriously persecuted; their Society was declared 'dissolved' and property worth six million sterling was confiscated, but most of the three thousand Jesuit priests, novices and lay brothers, stayed in Spain and fourteen million pounds of theirs which was vested in private persons was not touched. Clericalism remained a strong force in Spain, and the Constituent Cortes had no hesitation in giving the vote to women, though it was generally supposed that their vote would be influenced by priests. . . . In spite of compromises, the Republic did more for Spain in eighteen months than the monarchy had done in half a century."¹

¹ J. Hampden Jackson, *The Post-War World*.

Spanish politics became a three-cornered fight between Don Manuel Azaña, Don Niceto Alcalá Zamora and Mgr. Frederico Tedeschini, the papal nuncio. Premier Azaña was bitterly anticlerical, President Zamora sincerely devout, and the papal nuncio clever, strong willed and subtle minded. The weight of excommunication lay heavily on the souls of Zamora, his wife, and the five children with whom he went to Mass every Sunday.

To the two large organizations, the Socialists of Azaña and the Radicals (sic) of Lerroux, a third was now added, that of the Catholic leader, Gil Robles. Formerly president of the Jesuit youth league, Los Hijos de San Luis, Robles, who attended Hitler's Nürnberg congress, then headed the Accion Popular, the new party which, in co-operation with the monarchists, won the December 1933 election. In the pretensions of the leader, the Accion Popular was a labor, not a Catholic party; he himself at first saluted the Republic which he declared sanctioned by Rome, but he favored a corporative state with land for the peasants, provided the landowners, his chief supporters, could be persuaded to surrender property peacefully. They could not.

In 1933 Robles announced the so-called "Anti-Marxist Coalition" for "the preservation of landed property and the defense of the Catholic religion." It was the most complete union of Fascist, reactionary, anti-Republican and anti-democratic forces which could be made; it was the old coalition of the big money, the landed gentry, the aristocracy, the army and the Church. When election time arrived, the priests, under instructions from their bishops, dominated the vote; they forced their congregations, and especially the women, to vote against the democratic republican parties; they circulated a catechism which said that mortal sin was committed by those who voted liberal.

The Fascist coalition, or "the consolidation of Spain's

Right Wing republican forces," as Carney, the pro-Robles correspondent of the *New York Times* reported (February 3, 1934), was "recommended without equivocation to Spanish Catholics by Pope Pius XI" and accomplished by the nuncio. Robles and Lerroux ruled as reactionaries and Catholics; they passed legislation for the landowners and the Church; they restored the subsidy for the rural priests; they did everything for the rich and they were antilabor openly. In Spain it was not necessary to make pretensions in favor of a Wagner Act, the A. F. of L., or the C. I. O., as American politicians and the American press does every election year. In Spain the class war, so completely disguised in America that the majority cannot recognize it, was openly admitted by both sides. In Spain it broke into revolution in October 1934. It was put down by Robles and Lerroux, thanks to the Foreign Legion and the Moors, who committed many individual as well as mass murders. As a result, "the left wingers retired to lick their wounds, re-collect their forces, and contemplate the Catholic Capitalist Government cutting the claws of the legislation of the liberal-socialist constituent assembly of the Republic."² The well-known journalist, Lawrence Fernsworth, devout Catholic and contributor to the Jesuit weekly *America*, was forced to protest the murderous actions of the Robles-Lerroux regime. He wrote:³

"I regret deeply that the Spanish correspondent of the N.C.W.C. was either so blinded by passion or so lacking in courage that he could not tell a bald truth which every Spaniard today knows regarding the atrocities in the Asturias. There is abundant evidence that the acts of savagery there constitute one of the most terrible chapters in modern European history. Casas Viejas pales beside it. My religion

² *idem.*

³ *America*, January 19, 1935.

gave me a heritage which I value above all else—a respect for justice and truth. Insofar as I am permitted to raise my voice, therefore, I intend to abide by those two principles regardless of whom the words they inspire may strike.

"America is wrong in assuming (by omission) that those charged with the government of the Church in Spain (as in Mexico) have not their share of responsibility for the undoubted injustices from which the Church in those countries now suffers. The most elemental logic tells us that those things do not spring into being without cause. In businesses and well-conducted governments, when things go wrong a survey is made to find out the causes and to remedy them. Why cannot the same be done with the Church when things go wrong with it in one country or another? Why cannot it have the courage to face all the facts? . . ."

"Going back to the atrocities, Gil Robles has a major share in the plot to suppress the truth and for that reason I cannot respect him. Moreover, he is doing the Church no service by his insistence upon making the Church issue the dominant one, thereby arousing passions and distrust. It is not the dominant issue in Spain. . . ."

The Robles-Lerroux era is known as "the two black years," black denoting both clerical power and political repression. The great problem in Spain (as elsewhere) is economic, and Spanish economy had to do with the land. The Republic of 1931 had distributed some land, not much; but the Fascist regime was pledged to the landowners as well as the Church, and it not only failed to give land to the land-hungry impoverished peasants, and the 2,000,000 penniless landworkers, but it actually took land back and restored it to the church-going landowners. Hunger and anticlericalism, therefore, again marched throughout the country.

The law, which had helped the reactionaries, provided for one deputy for each 50,000 inhabitants of the provinces and

made every town of more than 140,000 inhabitants a separate constituency. Whether this is a fair system or not cannot now be argued; at all times it was denounced by those parties, Right or Left, who got the worst of it, but the system did help the reactionaries many times, and in 1936 it was to be of aid to the Liberals. The February 1936 election gave the following results:

Socialists, 85; Republican Left, 75; Republican Union, 32; Catalanian Esquerra, 20, and Communists, 14; total, 226. (Center Group, 55.)

C.E.D.A. (Robles and company), 94; Agrarians, 12; Monarchists, 12; Independents, 11; Traditionalists, 11; various, 3; total, 143.

As for the popular vote, there is a great dispute still raging as to its totals. The Catholic organ *A.B.C.* claimed that the Right had received 4,570,000 and the Left only 4,356,000 votes; there was a question about certain districts where terrorism was charged to government officials and a recount ordered, and there is still the question of counting the Center votes for either the Clerico-Fascists or the Popular Front, but there can be no dispute about the legality of the overwhelming victory for the latter which the reactionary and clerical press admitted had won the election in conformity with the laws and the constitution. Americans who recall Grover Cleveland's second campaign in which he received a majority of the popular vote and lost in the electoral college will understand the results in Spain. They may not have registered the popular will but they were legal and demanded public loyalty. As to the popular vote, however, the evidence is plain that whatever terrorism did exist which corrupted the voting, it was the terrorism exercised by the party that controlled the police and the polls, the party in power (as is always the case) in this instance, the Right coalition. There is also no doubt that a majority of the

hierarchy meddled in the political campaign and threatened the ignorant peasantry with brimstone and fire in hell if they voted the Popular Front.

One of the first acts of the reconstituted republican Cortes majority was to outlaw Fascism. Internal disorder followed. The clerico-monarchist leader, Calvo Sotelo, warned the government that if an attempt were made to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat there would be a "counterattack to set up a totalitarian state." The evidence was plain that although the official party had been abolished and its leaders imprisoned, Fascism was even stronger in many of the Right parties, still not willing to declare themselves openly Fascist.

The president of the Republic now faced a parliament which insisted that the provisions of the constitution which were particularly hard on the Catholic Church should be enforced. In 1931 Zamora, a devout Catholic, attempted to halt the program of separation of Church and state, dissolution of the Jesuit order and confiscation of its property, outlawing of the Church from the educational program, and other measures which would make the Church impotent and poor. He gained many compromises. When Robles grew strong he wanted to receive the clerical party into the government and would have done so had the Left coalition not warned him it would consider this treasonable. Then came the massacres of the Asturians in 1934 and the popular demand that the Robles-Lerroux clerico-Fascist regime be punished, but President Zamora refused to do anything about it, and therefore in 1936 the Cortes, by an overwhelming majority, drove the first president of the Republic—chosen because he was a good middle-of-the-road compromiser—out of office.

In the first months of the new republican regime the libertarian movement, suppressed for years by the clerico-

Fascists, quickly gained courage and momentum. From all parties of the Popular Front there came a demand that the agricultural laborer and the industrial worker must share in the political victory. The dispossessed were to come into their own, and the exploiters, whether landowners or factory owners, banks, corporations, or the Church, would have to pay. But there was no indication of violent or illegal methods. Even the Communists, who issued a manifesto declaring the Azaña government could not be regarded as the representative of the majority of people, the workers and peasants, reaffirmed their pledge to the Popular Front pact and ordered Communists to support the state. "We have a long road to travel in the company of the Left Republicans," concluded the statement of the secretary general of the Communist party.

In April, according to the British Foreign Office expert on Spain, Charles Duff, there was an impressive welcome at the Madrid Town Hall to a group of Spanish Communists who had just returned from Russia; there were no less than 5,000 automobiles in the procession, and for the first time it was noted that a large number of women (estimated at 30 per cent of the crowd) who were the most Catholic and Conservative elements, participated in the reception. More impressive still, Mr. Duff relates, was the demonstration in the province of Badajoz where 60,000 agricultural workers, led by the Communist delegates of the Cortes, seized many great estates and divided land among the landless, and then demanded that tools for earning their livelihood be furnished them by the government. In other parts of Spain peasants did the same things without radical leadership.

There were joined throughout Spain, in a libertarian movement, victims of oppression who knew nothing of Marxianism or even Republicanism, labor unions of every political color, almost the entire intellectual class, and people

regardless of class who had humanitarian ideals. On this side there were a large number of priests and a few higher members of the hierarchy, but there is no denying that the majority of archbishops and bishops ranged themselves alongside the reactionary parties: Monarchists, Agrarians, Traditionalists, C.E.D.A. (Robles) and Sotelo's semi-Fascists. Eighty-five per cent of the officers were on the Fascist side. Propaganda of the Italian kind, and later direct from Germany, circulated in all the barracks. It is more than a coincidence that the July rebellion preceded the carrying into effect of the government's plan to replace the known corrupted Fascist officers with those known to support the Republic. If once the army had been made safe for democracy, Spain would have been permitted to go forward toward a co-operative commonwealth in peace and prosperity.

In the spring and early summer of 1936 there was already a sort of civil war raging in Spain. One of the excuses for the Franco rebellion now given by Catholic apologists was this period which they style "anarchy" and "chaos." There were strikes, land seizures, attacks on churches—Robles claimed 160 were destroyed and 251 damaged—and insubordination in the army. Many of these acts of violence were found to be the work of Fascist *agents provocateurs*. In Madrid the government found documentary evidence of German intrigue. One of the immediate acts leading to the civil war, the assassination of Sotelo, was the reprisal for the assassination of Lieutenant José Castillo, Republican leader of police, by Sotelo's Fascists.

Considering the fact that the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic press has adopted the Hitlerian propaganda technique of crying "Red" as a defense of supporting the Fascists, it is interesting to look back upon the words of priests and press of early 1936. In *America* of March 7, 1936, its

own contributor, Father Owen B. McGuire, wrote that "the masses of the working class (of Spain) have been lost to the Church . . . it is due to two causes, both equally deplorable; the neglect, material and spiritual, of the toiling masses. . . . The neglect of the working class by their spiritual guides was no less deplorable and is incomprehensible when one considers the many warnings they had in the insurrections of the past 100 years." On March 21, the Jesuit journal says editorially that there have been Marxist and Socialist troubles in Spain, and church burnings, but there is no mention of Communists; on March 28, it says of Spain: "Nevertheless, the results also show that the country, as a whole, if we include several Left parties, is unalterably opposed to a Soviet regime." There are more references to troubles but not to Communists. It is evident that the Communist hue and cry, raised later, was a propaganda method, not a matter of truth.

Analyzing the Spanish elections, *Blackfriars'* correspondent, John Quinlan, wrote in the April 1936 issue that "we cannot help saying that the prospects for Catholicism are brighter now than they have been at any other time during the past hundred years of Spanish history." The *Catholic News* (New York) carried a despatch (February 29) from the Rev. Manuel Granna, in Madrid, asserting that "on the whole, the Government is maintaining order and the normal life of the country is being resumed." The *London Times* confirmed similar reports. Spain's political difficulties "are due mostly to economic ills," wrote Frederick Birchall in the *New York Times* (June 28, 1936) three weeks before the rebellion; "wages in the agricultural districts of Spain are almost unbelievably low." He admitted that peonage existed, a wage of 2 or 3 pesetas a day, patriarchal feudalism, absentee landlordism. "The Duke of Alba for instance who has almost 90,000 hectares (222,000 acres) of land in Spain,

valued at 114,000,000 pesetas, spends most of his life in London." The Duke at the time was actually planning the rebellion and financing the rebels. Calvo Sotelo had admitted to Birchall that 30 per cent of the upper class consumed 60 to 70 per cent of the national revenue; "only about one third goes to the 70 per cent who live on the land." Birchall concluded: "Improve living conditions for these millions of the terribly poor and whether the improvement comes from the Right or Left, there will be no danger of either Bolshevism or Fascism in Spain." This is exactly what happened: the Popular Front tried to improve the conditions of the land and industrial workers, and the Reactionaries—wealth, the army, the hierarchy—attacked.

It was known even before July 1936 that Robles, Sanjurjo, Franco, and other anti-Republican leaders had conspired with Mussolini and Hitler. The evidence was furnished for years by the Loyalist government and denied in the Catholic press. In June 1939 Hitler and Mussolini boasted they had discussed, planned, and supported the rebellion from its inception. All previous reports that a rebellion had been hatched in Moscow were based on Hitler propaganda and a few forgeries.

During the civil war each side accused the other of atrocities. If it were true that both were guilty, there would be at least this difference: the Loyalists were engaged in a class struggle to maintain the rule of the working people, the middle class and the intellectuals, against whom the upper class had revolted, whereas the Francoists were engaged in what the cardinals called a "crusade" to maintain Christianity. They, at least, should have fought as Christians. The former Barcelona contributor to the Jesuit weekly *America*, Fernsworth, sent its editor, Francis Talbot, S.J., a letter posing just that question: "whether killing is no longer murder when done by the champions of a holy cause?"

Fernsworth reaffirmed his Catholic faith, mentioned some of the worst Fascist atrocities. But *America* refused to publish the letter. When *The Nation* printed it, Father Talbot replied that murder was murder: "I have certainty that the Loyalists have been guilty of atrocities," but he granted only a "probability" of Franco murders. A British priest named Grimley, addressing a Fascist meeting in New York, laughed at the oft-repeated reports that women and children were the majority of air-raid victims. "Why is it that these women and children always seem to get in the way of the bombs?" he asked. And Father Thorning defended the massacre of a thousand civilians in Barcelona. Many thousands of Catholic women and children were killed in the cities bombed by Italian and German ⁴—and a few Spanish Fascist—airmen and many thousands were willfully machine-gunned on the roads when they fled from cities. These are facts. The evidence of Badajoz, Guernica, and many other scenes of Franco atrocities is disputed by Catholic spokesmen despite eyewitness accounts by Catholic journalists. But there is no disputing murder from the air. On the other hand, it is also a fact that Premier Negrin of the Spanish Republic instructed Hidalgo de Cisneros, chief of the air service, never to bomb civilians on the Franco side. The great new war weapon, terrorism, was therefore lost to the Loyalists, but they saved the lives of the good Catholics who, although behind Franco's trenches, were, in a majority, for the Republic.

The Loyalists told the truth throughout the war. This was bad tactics, but they were not instructed in the modern war code by Germans and Italians, as was Franco. The Loyalists never hid the truth of the murder of priests and nuns and the burning of churches in the early days of the rebellion.

⁴The figures for March 1938: 3,000 killed; 5,000 hospital cases; 20,000 wounded.

Franco took the army and police with him, and there was chaos for a few weeks in which atrocities were committed. But the Loyalist government told the truth when it claimed that it had never killed a priest or nun or burned a church. Such violence as occurred was the work of elements that got out of hand, and when order was restored, crime was punished. Franco, on the testimony of great Catholics (Bernanos for one) deliberately and cold-bloodedly murdered his opponents.

Every morning during the war Franco attended Holy Mass, and every night he commended himself "with fervor to his guardian angel and the Virgin Mary, after approving the reports of the day's operations, in which he triumphantly recorded the number of enemy corpses picked up on the battlefield." It is estimated that 1,200,000 persons were killed in the war, and since Franco had ten times as many planes as the Loyalists, ten times as many guns, and more than ten times as many bombs, shells, tanks and other death-dealing instruments, it is most likely that Franco, who started the war, killed close to a million persons. In May and June, 1939, his tribunals were shooting one person every nine minutes; thousands had been executed, the arrests were at least a million, according to Fascist official admissions; but Franco went to the Church of Santa Barbara, "delivered his sword to God and gave thanks to God for his victory over 'the enemies of Truth in this Century.' " ⁵

Pius XI had asked Franco to stop killing civilians. But when all the massacres were over, Pius XII, whose elevation had been considered a slap at Nazi and Fascist intrigue, gave his blessing to representatives of Franco's army, calling them "my beloved sons who bring to the heart of your father an immense consolation because you have been the Defenders of the Faith and civilization of your Fatherland." The Pope

⁵ Carney, *New York Times*, May 21, 1939.

repeated a previous radio greeting in which he called Franco's bloody troops defenders of "the cause of God and religion." On that very same day the Associated Press reported arrangements for a visit by Mussolini's son-in-law, Count Ciano, for the purpose of making a military alliance, and other news agencies reported mass arrests in all big cities and an increase in the daily executions of labor leaders, Liberals, intellectuals, as well as Socialists, Anarchists and Communists. And Cardinal Isidoro Cardinal Goma y Tomas, archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain, one of the worst enemies of democracy and the Republic since 1931, announced that "Catholicism must be the guiding spirit of the New Spain after it had suffered the terrible consequences of systematic de-Christianization."

THE POPES AND HITLER

The Vatican is opposed to the new nationalism, but Europe becomes more and more nationalistic every year. The Popes are opposed to militarism but Europe is arming for many wars. The corporative or totalitarian state, its monopoly of youth, the subjugation of the individual, the state control of the family, and its attempt to control religion, are abhorrent to the Popes, and have been denounced in encyclicals and letters to the bishops; but Germany and Austria copied the Duce's plan, one after another the terrorized small states under the Berlin-Rome axis have become more and more Fascist, and Spain has been conquered by the Fascist legions and ideology—with the aid of Moors wearing the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Events, movements, and trends in Europe caused a new crisis in the Vatican in 1939, because they brought not only Fascist aggressive war but also the conflict for the spiritual leadership and political directives of the Church. In Germany, Austria, Hungary, Spain, the Vatican

today exerts itself in *Realpolitik* as well as spiritual mysticism; it faces the double problem, a state dealing with other states whose policies antagonize its own and must be tempered, adjusted, reconciled, compromised; and a spiritual guide which admits no criticism.

The great problem for the Vatican today is Statolatry. It is as true for Pius XII as it was for Pius XI, who denounced the Statolatry under which Mussolini was attempting to control the Church. The worship of the state, the introduction of mysticism, of fanaticism, into political life, which raises the state above its people, which tends "to monopolize completely the young, from tenderest years up to manhood and womanhood, for the exclusive advantage of a party and of a regime based on an ideology which clearly resolves itself into a true, a real pagan worship of the State"—was denounced by Pius XI in his famous encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno* (June 29, 1931), which Monsignor Spellman of Boston (later archbishop of New York) smuggled out of Rome to escape Mussolini's censorship and wrath. And since the encyclical was written, a new Pope has mounted to the throne of St. Peter and three new states have entered the sphere of its strictures: Germany, Austria, and Spain.

The ideas of dictatorship, Fascism, state worship, nationalism, militarism, are triumphing in Continental Europe; they sometimes appear to be threatening to engulf the democratic nations, the republics, and England, and they march forward with terrorism and bloodshed under the banner of the Rising Sun in China. The Vatican policies of internationalism, peace, disarmament, the insistence on the right of the Church to monopolize the education of youth, its demand that it receive the first allegiance of the individual and mass conscience, deny totally the ideologies of the reactionary dictators and would-be dictators. By all rules of

reason the Church is anti-Fascist and yet by all the workings of opportunism we find it more and more co-operating with the Fascist nations.

The conflict between the Catholic Church and the German government follows the strategy and parallels the events of the triangular war between Mussolini, Don Sturzo, and the Vatican a decade earlier. It was in 1923 that Pope Pius XI, to save Catholicism, sacrificed the Catholic Party, and in 1929 the sweet fruit of this action was the Lateran Treaty—while in 1931 the sour second crop was the dispute over Catholic Action, which resulted in a compromise and which must again demand revision someday.

In his dealings with the Vatican, Hitler began by condensing Mussolini's Fascist history. The impatient Führer could not wait a year to destroy the antagonistic Catholic political leader, three years to smash the opposition political parties, five years to announce a corporative or totalitarian state, ten years to achieve even the rudimentary framework of such a state. Mussolini had time, but economic pressure gallops over Germany like an apocalyptic horseman. Hitler tries to move heaven and earth to escape the wild hoofs. He orders the Fascist state to function. No one, priest or politician, must stand in the middle of the road. *Gleichschaltung* is the slogan. Those whom he cannot rule or absorb must be exiled or murdered. There is no time to waste.

Paradoxically enough, it was the German Centrum party which did much to bring about the dictatorship—and its own downfall. The Centrum, holding fast to the principles which triumphed over Bismarck, refused in February before the 1933 elections to commit itself to the proposed one-year "toleration" of Hitler in the Reichstag. Monsignor Kaas, head of the party, insisted that the dissolution of parliament was illegal, that the Centrum had not been consulted, that

it therefore placed itself with the opposition. Almost immediately afterward several Nazis beat up the Catholic leader Stegerwald, and the Centrum made an official plea to President Hindenburg to safeguard its liberty.

It was therefore Catholic refusal to support a dictatorship which resulted in Hitler's various measures to make of the March election a mandate for dictatorship. Monsignor Kaas, in other words, was the champion of political liberty, just as Don Sturzo had been before him in leading the Catholic opposition to Mussolini.

But unfortunately, the Catholic Centrum dissolved itself on July 3, 1933, after the Papal Secretary of State, Pacelli, had reassured German Catholics they would not be deserted by the Vatican. In the same way that it found it expedient to sacrifice the Partito Popolari of Don Sturzo in Italy several years earlier, the Vatican asked that the Catholic party quit in Germany, and that for it be substituted the Catholic League, devoted to social and moral rather than political activities. Catholicism was to be saved from Hitler just as it had been saved from Mussolini. It had worked in Italy; but in Germany up to the outbreak of the Second World War there has been no success attendant upon this surrender.

Again the Italian conflict over the control of youth organizations was repeated within a few months. The concordat which Italy made seven years after the advent of Fascism was achieved in the first year of Nazism, and the conflict over the new *modus vivendi* which followed in two years in Italy, arrived in Germany in almost as many months. How, in a totalitarian state, to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's—in other words, to pay tribute and allegiance to two forces which claim the right of entire control of human activities—is a matter which cannot be settled with mere treaties.

Thus, in 1925, the year before the disappearance of the

free press in Italy, *Il Piccolo* stated the problem in this way: "We cannot live on good terms with both God and the Duce. Christianity and Fascism are absolute antipodes. The choice therefore for good Catholics of Italy is, love or violence, Christ or Mussolini." But on Good Friday, 1934, Monsignor Nicholas Bares, Catholic Bishop of Berlin, preaching that "no opponent has ever conquered the Church of Christ," that despite "sorrow and suffering imposed upon it . . . the Church will triumph over its foes," concluded that "the world cannot live without Truth and Justice; there is no middle course between Christ and anti-Christ," meaning, of course, Christ and Hitler.

So it came about that revolver shots were fired into the Munich home of Cardinal Faulhaber, and that the Pope, in order to save the primate in Germany from vulgar arrest, made him a diplomatic envoy of the Vatican. Meanwhile hundreds of priests have been arrested and thousands of Catholic political officials and leaders have been ousted from their positions or jailed or maltreated physically. The concordat, which the Church accepted in fear of its nationalization or perhaps a *Gleichschaltung* which would have incorporated it with the new Nazi Church, has been set aside by Hitler.

The cause of youth, education, and control of family life remain the chief problems in Germany as they are in Italy. Pius XI was terribly disappointed in Hitler. He was especially anxious to co-operate with the Nazi because he recognized in the fanatical leader an even more powerful captain of the armies against Bolshevism than the Mikado in Japan. The Vatican, having made Communism its first enemy, does not care about the bloody hands of those who are willing to be its friends in the present crusade.

Some Catholics, however, found out soon enough that although Hitler and the Pope were fighting side by side in

one war, Nazism was attempting to make of Catholicism its second national scapegoat. The same reasons for this policy were given as for Hitler's treatment of the Jews: first, economic; second, religious. Hitler, born a Catholic, is not only anticlerical, but also pagan in what passes for his outlook or philosophy of life; and like his first teacher and present pupil, Mussolini the atheist, he plans to subjugate everyone and everything, including organized religion, to the state—and to himself.

The Hitler mentality is completely betrayed in a document issued to teachers of the Hitler Youth Movement and first reported in the Vatican's *Osservatore Romano* which called it "the most viciously anti-Christian statement ever written." Entitled "Official directions for the philosophical teaching of the Hitler youth in Austria," it was not intended for publication.⁶ Of its 46 items here follow some of the most interesting:

1. Christianity is a religion for slaves and fools, for "the last shall be first and the first shall be last."
2. Christianity is the same as Communism.
3. Christianity regards Negroes and Germans as equal.
4. The New Testament is a Jewish swindle on the part of four Evangelists, because the teaching is copied exactly from the Indian belief of Jischnu Christa.
5. The Church is international. 6. The Church always works with violence and terror. Where is the love of one's neighbor and one's enemy?
11. Everything that's against Christianity, even a race that is not German, is good (Napoleon, Prince Eugene).
14. There is no "Christian Culture."
16. Christianity corrupted the Teutons because it has brought to the German mind such ideas as adultery, theft, etc., which they had not known before.

⁶Published in *The Universe*, London; *Daily Mirror*, London, and *Catholic News*, New York, Dec. 17, 1938.

17. Wickedness passes, goodness remains. Therefore the Catholic Church must perish.

18. Christianity is a substitute for Judaism, made by Jews with headquarters in Rome. 19. Jesus is a Jew.

22. How died Christ? Whining at the Cross. How Planeta (the assassin of Dollfuss)? Heil Hitler, long live Germany!

26. Nero was quite right with his persecutions. He destroyed the Jewish spirit (i.e., Christianity).

30. The Papacy is a swindle. The Pope claims to represent God on earth. But after Peter there was no Pope for 150 years. The Popes were always the worst possible persons: e.g., Alexander VI.

33. Christianity has always hindered the development of the sciences, medicine, etc.

35. Ignatius of Loyola was of Jewish origin.

42. When Germany ceases to support the Church, the Church will perish.

43. Fate is greater than God.

The Hitler regime has destroyed the Catholic labor unions, the Catholic political party, the Catholic press, the Catholic youth movement, and now threatens to confiscate the wealth of the Church. It has done and is doing everything the Vatican accuses Soviet Russia of doing, and nevertheless, Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII have stood by with their hands outstretched ready to shake Hitler's hand if it is ever extended. The Pope and the hierarchy which accused the "Reds" of the murder of priests in Spain never said a word against the murder of thousands by Hitler's aviators. Throughout the extreme reactionary Catholic press there is praise or at least apology for Hitlerism. "We (Catholics) are certainly not apologists of Hitler," said the *Catholic Herald* (November 19, 1937), "yet the fact remains that Catholic sacramental and devotional life in Germany continues in full vigor." But this statement is not true, argues the German Catholic Prince Loewenstein, although it is

expressed too frequently in Catholic circles. He quotes Cardinal Faulhaber who said, "It is not necessary to burn churches to have religious persecution," and adds: "The illiterates who burned churches in Catalonia, after the army, that 'defender of law and order' had mutinied, are certainly less guilty in the eyes of God than Franco's neo-pagan allies who in Germany and Austria are burning the Church."

Prince Loewenstein believes that the policy of the Church toward Spain and its Hitlerite and Fascist allies may bring about a tragic period in the Church's history; he fears an internal landslide, similar to that which followed the Church's support against the Hohenstaufens when "the seeds for 'national Churches' were sown, and ultimately the Protestant forces broke away from the Holy See." The Catholic crisis in Germany increases as Hitler adds to his empire.

STILL PRISONER IN THE VATICAN

In Fascist Italy a short time ago occurred another of the frequent crises between the Pope and Mussolini, when each expressed a complete denial of the ideology and political policy of the other, proving again that the positions of 1929 and 1931⁷ (when Fascists burned the Pope's pictures) remain irreconcilable. Fascist state and educational policies are the antithesis of Catholic policies, will always be so, and yet the Popes continue to further the ambitions of the Fascist Duce.

The failure of Pius XI to control the Hierarchy during the Ethiopian massacre endeared him to Fascism. Nine cardinals and 79 bishops of Italy blessed Mussolini's war at a time the men of good will and the democratic nations of the world

⁷For a full history of the conflict between the Vatican and Fascism see *The Vatican: Yesterday—Today—Tomorrow*, Chapters XXIII and XXIV, and *Sawdust Caesar*, Chapter XXIII.

damned Mussolini. No one who saw the Italian hierarchy participate in politics and in war-mongering can ever say again that the Catholic Church devotes itself to matters of Faith and Morals, and leaves politics and wars alone. The Italian bishops, writes Prof. Gaetano Salvemini,⁸ the historian of Fascism whose documentary evidence has never been denied, "delivered addresses and wrote circular letters justifying the war, urging people to discipline and sacrifice, and protesting against sanctions, the League of Nations and Great Britain. They attended or sent their delegates to ceremonies in which war propaganda was carried on. . . ." The Cardinal Archbishop of Milan said that "on the fields of Ethiopia the Italian flag carries in triumph the cross of Christ, breaks the chains of the slaves and makes straight the way of missionaries of the gospel."

The clergy offered gold and silver to Mussolini to wage the war. The Bishop of Civita Castellana gave the Duce his gold pastoral chain and a Fascist salute. The Bishop of Miniato promised Mussolini to melt church gold and church bells. Fifteen cardinals "both of curia and dioceses . . . directly or indirectly took part in Fascist demonstrations during the Ethiopian war." On October 2, 1935, when Italian troops advanced in Ethiopia, all Italians gathered to listen to Mussolini's radio speech. "The most effective contributors to the colossal din were the bells of all the churches in the land. According to canon law, church bells may not be used for profane purposes except with the explicit permission of the bishop, or in case of public emergency. . . ."

The Rome correspondent of the *London Times* stated that "a thousand belfries" had filled the air with the sound of their bells and that even the great bell and the five minor bells of St. Peter's had tolled.

"The diocese of Rome is the diocese of the pope," says

⁸ *Christendom*, Winter, 1937.

Prof. Salvemini. "If it was true that he allowed the bells of St. Peter's to toll together with the bells of Rome, Pius XI became guilty of a plain act of partisanship. Therefore, the *Osservatore Romano* stated that there was no truth in the assertion that the great bells of St. Peter's had been rung; of the five small bells, no more than two had given signs of life by sounding at 3:45 P.M., and that because it was vesper hour. As a matter of fact, whoever consults the manual of rites of St. Peter's Church will find that vesper hour on October 2 falls at 4:15 P.M. and not at 3:45 P.M. The writers of the *Osservatore Romano* tried to conceal the pope's responsibility by a denial of a fact which they well knew to be true. They lied *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. . . . What matters is that Roman bells took part in the demonstration and that the diocese of Rome is the diocese of the pope. . . ."

How can these facts be excused? Cardinal Hinsley called the Pope "a helpless old man" in the Ethiopian matter, who could not denounce his neighbor (Italy) as a law breaker and a brigand without putting "a grievous burden on the consciences of such subjects of his neighbor as believe that neighbor to be right." Teeling believes "Mussolini brought all possible pressure to bear on the Pope to induce him to bless the Italian armies." The Pope did not do this, but "he raised no finger to stop Italian bishops"; as a result, the Pope threw "his weight on the side of the Totalitarian leaders; . . . the Vatican has thrown in its lot to a considerable extent with Mussolini . . . the injury to Catholicism of the Pope's attitude has been almost unbelievable; . . . the Pope's behaviour has caused a tremendous set-back to the advancement of the missions in Africa and Asia." Teeling confirms the report that "during the period of sanctions, the Vatican used its influence with all South American States which are Catholic to vote in favour of lifting the sanctions."

When the Ethiopian massacre was finished, Archbishop Castellani of Rhodes was named papal nuncio at Addis Ababa. It was his plan to return the Coptic Church, which Emperor Menelik had once taken out of its jurisdiction, to the Vatican, and to convert Ethiopians and Mohammedans. Swedish, Swiss and American missions got their orders to leave the country. A monopoly on religion was small pay by Mussolini for a large service.

But when, in midsummer, 1938, ten Fascist savants (sic) issued a manifesto declaring the Italian people "Aryan, Nordic and heroic" and Mussolini copied Hitler's anti-Semitic regulations, Pius XI renewed his courageous attack on the man he had once called "sent by Providence" and again "Satan himself." When Fascists proposed to exclude members of Catholic Action from the official party because of the new racial doctrine, Pius XI said: "The Pope therefore says 'Beware.' I advise you not to strike at the Catholic Action associations. . . . Whoever strikes at Catholic Action strikes at the Pope; whoever strikes at the Pope, dies. This is truth and history proves it." It must also be recorded that Cardinal Schuster who had been spoken of as Mussolini's candidate for the papacy, denounced the Duce's newly invented racism as "a kind of heresy . . . an international danger no less than that of Bolshevism itself."

When the conclave met to choose a successor to Pius XI, the inspired Fascist press did its best to intimidate its members and to force the election of a pro-Fascist cardinal. The elevation of Cardinal Pacelli was at first regarded as a blow to Reaction in all its forms: Italian, German, Spanish. But one of Pius XII's first actions was to give his blessing to the German, Italian and Spanish soldiers of world Fascism.

THE FAR EASTERN AXIS

The Vatican's policy toward the Japanese form of Fascism is extremely interesting—and shocking—to Americans. The reader may remember the alarming headlines of October 14 and 15, 1937, over an Associated Press story quoting “a reliable Vatican source” saying that the Holy See, in carrying out the Catholic Church's world-wide campaign against Bolshevism, had “instructed its hierarchy and missions in the Far East to cooperate with Japanese action in China.” Most likely the information came from the Vatican's Monsignor Pucci, who for decades has been the American journalistic corps' informer on Catholic policy. The dispatch quoted the Vatican source, saying the memorandum promises “to give Japanese military authorities the clear impression that on the part of the Catholic Church there is no obstacle to complete collaboration.”

This statement was denied immediately in Rome. But not in Tokyo. The Associated Press not only reaffirmed the absolute truth of its story but revealed the fact it had asked for and received complete verification before sending out the original. Although it carried the denials of Monsignor Pizzardo of the Vatican, the Most Rev. Ameleto Cicognana, apostolic delegate, in Washington and the Vatican semi-official news bureau, the Associated Press to this very day insists its story is true.

What is still lacking is a frank statement from the Vatican saying just where it does stand in the Sino-Japanese war.

It is interesting to note that a year earlier Teeling had written that “the feeling in China and in the Philippines amongst Catholic missionaries has been that they will get a fair deal and freedom to push their religion should Japanese get control,” and again, that “the Vatican is also intensely

interested in the development of her relations with Japan in order to get control of the eventual development of Christianity in those parts of China which she believes will one day come under Japanese influences."

There is plain evidence of the friendship between the Vatican and Japan. Shortly after the new state of Manchukuo was announced, Japan turned to the Holy See for recognition at a time the great powers refused to accept this McCarthy regime. *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the Catholic fortnightly, remarked⁹ thereupon that "Japan today respects Christianity in general, but Catholicism particularly. It is just as favorable as Russia is unfavorable." In January, 1938, the Japanese Catholic leader, Admiral Yamamota, was cordially received by the then papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli, and although the press reported that a request for official recognition of Manchukuo was received "coldly," the Vatican joined the Fascist powers, Germany and Italy, in recognizing the pseudostate which Japanese militarism established as a frontier against Russia and a base for the war of annexation of China. It is true that Pius XI protested the murder of Chinese civilians by the Japanese, but the Vatican remained silent after the Japanese officially promised to cease bombing unfortified cities and slaughtering defenseless civilians.

In the Catholic press there is criticism of Japan in the liberal wing, but approval and defense in the reactionary wing. Thus Father Curran (of Catholic Truth fame) assails the boycott of Japanese silk as a "Red" plot, and *The Sign* frowns upon boycott or sanctions saying that while it might strike Japan a severe blow "it would also cause a severe loss to American and British trade and industry." The Rev. Hugo Lasalle, superior of the Jesuits in Japan, declared (in the *Montreal Gazette*) that Japan is not fired with the idea

⁹ January 15, 1935.

of extending its borders at the expense of other nations, but is merely wrestling with the serious problem of establishing "a proper material and spiritual standard." But the most notorious support for Japan comes from the most notorious priest in America. Using isolationism as a pretext, and President Roosevelt as the victim of his attack, Father Coughlin in his broadcasts of February 6 and 13, 1938, defended Japan in China, sneered at "propagandists at home and in England, France and Russia" who pointed "to 'atrocities' committed in China by Japan," and concluded with the Japanese slogan: "Asia for the Asiatics," meaning Asia for Japan.

One thing is obvious: the Vatican is the arch-enemy of Russia, and Japan as well as Germany could carry the papal colors into enemy territory. But Japan has also become more and more threatening to all the democracies and particularly to the United States, and military men would not refuse a coalition with Russia to stop Japanese aggression. This will put American Catholics in a difficult position. In midsummer 1939 they denounced the British and French plan to form an alliance with Russia to save democracy from an attack by the Fascist Internationale—Italy, Germany, Spain and Japan—but were placed in another dilemma by Hitler's treaty with Russia. The new alignment in Europe can only add to the severity of the Catholic crisis.

CHAPTER 11

Catholic States and Parties

1. AUSTRIA: CATHOLIC AND CORPORATIVE

IN AUSTRIA the struggle between clericals and Marxists began the day the empire was overthrown. It was complicated naturally by all the political circumscriptions and the economic absurdities which the peace treaty imposed upon the nation. Vienna was Socialist and the countryside Conservative. Vienna was anticlerical and the land intensely Catholic. The country, agrarian, Catholic, Conservative, was opposed to the industrial, Socialist, anticlerical city in parliament, in the Heimwehr versus the Schutzbund, in thinking and in action.

The first important climax of this antagonism was the 1927 uprising. It failed because the Catholic Heimwehr began marching on the capital. There was no Bolshevism in Vienna, but Monsignor Seipel made it the issue for political purposes when he allied himself with the Heimwehr. From that time on the Heimwehr marched, well armed, well supplied with money, and under powerful leaders. In October, 1927, Seipel blessed the Heimwehr and on November 1, 1928, openly became its Führer.

Seipel had a grandiose idea. He was willing to establish a Heimwehr dictatorship, he did not object to the restoration of the Hapsburgs under Prince Otto, but these were

but small incidents toward the creation of a great central bloc of Catholic states. "Austrichelieu," as he was called, dreamed of a Catholic Austria, a Catholic Hungary, a union with Catholic Slovakia, with Catholic Croatia, perhaps even with Transylvania (torn from the side of Hungary) and eventually union with Catholic Bavaria. He hoped to become the statesman who had created a new Holy Roman Empire.

In 1928, when Monsignor Seipel, who had resigned from the government, planned to return to Vienna at the head of his Heimwehr, Marcel Fodor, representing the *Manchester Guardian* and *Philadelphia Record*, warned his friend and old associate in the European labor movement, Arthur Henderson, of what impended. Interpellations in the House of Commons on the secret arming of the Heimwehr echoed in the *Chambre des Députés* and in a moment the *coup d'état* was sidetracked. England and France insisted on disarmament and warned about loans. Seipel, however, continued planning. To further his scheme in Hungary, where he favored Otto rather than the two ruling Calvinists, Regent Horthy and Premier Bethlen, he inspired the naming of Dr. Justinian Sereďi as Primate of the nation. In 1930, he became Foreign Minister. The Heimwehr, under Prince Ernst Ruediger von Stahremberg, at this time announced its program of Fascism, anti-Semitism, monarchism and clericalism.

Seipel died too soon to see the results of all his planning. The Heimwehr, which he might have led as an army to establish the Danubian Catholic state, now divided, the clerical wing supporting Chancellor Vaugoin's Christian Socialist Party, the nationalist wing supporting the Hitler movement. Of Seipel himself it must be said that his actions were those of a free citizen; he did not represent the Church or prejudice the interests of the Church in all his plans. But his dream of a Catholic empire did not die with him.

Dr. Engelbert Dollfuss was undoubtedly a most devout Catholic. Before accepting the chancellorship he spent a whole night in prayer; each morning he prayed on his knees for half an hour. He declared with almost fanatical passion that he intended to found a "Christian corporative state . . . *with God's help.*" He was in the habit of ending his sentences with those three words. When he made his visit to Hungary on February 7, 1934, the "practical" Vice-Chancellor Fey used the Heimwehr and the police to provoke an attack and destroy the Socialist movement in Austria. That the leaders and the armed men who destroyed Socialism were members of the Catholic Heimwehr is a fact. Major Fey admitted he did not accept any offer to negotiate, and never wanted any agreements with the "Red Bolsheviks." Prince von Stahremberg admitted that the inspiration for the attack came from Rome. But there are two Romes, two powers there which had a vital interest in Austria, and one of them is Caesar. From which Rome did the inspiration for the bombardment of apartment houses and the killing of men, women and children, come?

We have the testimony of Dr. Otto Bauer, intellectual head of the Austrian Socialist party, that great efforts were made, but too late, to join the Christian Socialist party in saving the state from the menace of Hitlerism. Catholic Socialists and Christian Socialists, that is, leaders of Bauer's party who were good churchmen, and leaders of Chancellor Dollfuss's own party, called upon Cardinal Innitzer, the Primate of Austria. He was friendly, but even he could do nothing to stop the Heimwehr from recourse to guns. For the slaughter which followed, Otto Bauer blames the Bishop of Linz and the Papal Nuncio, Monsignor Sibylla, "who both pushed the government into Fascist extremes, saying now is the time to destroy Socialism forever." From this statement it is evident that there was no defined policy: the

Archbishop of Vienna was for peace, the Bishop of Linz, in Bauer's words, was for "Fascist extremes."

To raise the cry of "Red Bolshevism" after the *fait accompli*, as Vice-Chancellor Major Fey did, was to deny well-established fact. It would be more truthful to say that there was no Bolshevism in Austria. In fact, the Socialists saved Vienna from Bolshevism in 1918 and 1919 and again in 1927. The election figures of the nation show some 3,500,000 voters, of whom 1,500,000 were Socialists, 70,000 Communists. Only 2 per cent of Austria's voters can be accused of Red Bolshevism. The 40 per cent who were Socialists were about as radical as the British Labour Party.

What were the results of the destruction of Socialism by the Heimwehr? Emil Fey was removed from command of the army; Dollfuss reaped the enmity of a large part of the Catholic world, of his own party, of many priests, of Cardinal Innitzer; the apartment houses were taken away from Socialist householders; priests were in charge of food relief; the crucifix was restored to all schools and the Catholic *Reichspost* praised the abolition of civil marriage service for divorced persons. Dollfuss tried to establish the Catholic Corporate State—*Austriam instaurare in Christo*—"to restore Austria to Christ." He insisted that "it is quite misleading to call it a dictatorship. It is merely a step toward the goal I have already announced: a Christian German Corporative State under authoritarian leadership." But the independent unions were destroyed, the press was muzzled, the political parties opposed to Dollfuss were outlawed. At the very moment a writer in *The Commonwealth*¹ was attacking my published statement that Austria had gone totalitarian and Fascist, and quoting Father Coyne saying Austria was democratic, that "the freedom of persons, press, association, meet-

¹ December 15, 1935.

ing, speech and dwelling all appear in the Constitution," noted Vienna correspondents, Gunther, Fodor and others were reporting the arrest of all persons attending meetings of anti-Dollfuss political parties, or publishing or speaking, or exercising republican civil liberties. There was not only Fascist suppression but also an additional religious censorship and control.

Dollfuss tried to destroy the great success Socialism had made in Vienna. Hugo Breitner had built 60,000 flats for workmen only, at \$2 a month or less; Dr. Julius Tandler had reconstructed the public welfare administration; great doctors were socializing medicine; the Socialist regime was establishing social security, and a better living than people had ever enjoyed. A healthier generation, a more intelligent generation, had been achieved despite national impoverishment.

As in Spain, the men of wealth and power opposed the poor and the intellectuals, and again the Church had to make its choice. It was a class war in Vienna, just as it was to be later in Spain. It was rich against poor, rich and middle class against the working class, and Catholic against Catholic, just as in Spain. The Fascists of Austria were supported by the rich Jews in just the same way the Nazis in Germany for many years had been given money by wealthy Jews, and had not Mussolini been financed by a group whose fiscal agent was the Banca Commerciale, whose head was the former Pole, the Jewish banker, Giuseppe Toeplitz? Among the subsidizers of clerico-Fascism's shock troops in Austria was Fritz Mandl, head of the Hirtenberg Munitions Works.

In the years of internal strife, paralleled with the battle against the progress of the Nazi movement in Austria, the Socialists acted "blamelessly," says Fodor, although apparently not powerfully enough. They were continually rebuffed

by Dollfuss, and their pleas for a united front against the Nazi brand of Fascism was rebuffed by the proponents of the indigenous brand.

In 1934, Fodor relates, the Socialists were willing to support Dollfuss, who began to hint at a deal with the Left which would safeguard Austria from the German Nazi plot, but he received word from Mussolini, via Secretary Suvich, that the Italian dictator wanted the entire Social Democratic movement destroyed.

As February 12 approached, it was evident that Dollfuss had sold out to Mussolini. As in Spain, a political movement, closely related to the Church, made use of guns, killed Catholics as well as non-Catholics, and established itself for the benefit of the ruling class. In each instance the leader was a man who spent much time at Mass, at confession, on his knees in prayer. Even if the sincerity of the leader is not questioned, his actions cannot be accepted by any humanitarian, by anyone who believes in either Christ, Buddha, Confucius, Jehovah, or any nonbloodthirsty deity. Nevertheless, "a Catholic review" printed a letter² stating: "When a man's faith is menaced it cannot be without anger to his immortal soul. Since there was no other way of removing the menace, Dollfuss would have been justified on this score alone in blowing the Socialists to pieces."

Catholic apologists may deny there is a legitimate cause for either wonder or resentment (against the apparent cooperation of the Church with bloody Fascist dictators), but the thunder of the cannon of that notable Catholic leader, Dollfuss, against the homes and bodies of Vienna workmen will be heard a long time in history.

When the foregoing paragraph was published in *The New Republic*, Mr. George N. Shuster replied that it gave "an utterly biased account of what happened in Austria—an ac-

² Reprinted in *The Commonweal*, July 14, 1936.

count against which I protest though space compels me to be satisfied with that." Since I regard Mr. Shuster as one of the leading liberal Catholics in America, I want to call his attention to the fact that the words he protests were written out of the statements of men who occupy a position analogous to his in Germany and Italy, although both are exiles. I refer to Prince Loewenstein and Don Sturzo. The former wrote: "How the so-called 'Christian-Social Party' and the Catholic press of Austria dealt with the Viennese Socialists has certainly not been forgotten. It was out of the blood of two thousand workers, their women and children, that the 'New Austria' rose in February 1934—hailed by many as an example of a 'truly Catholic State.'"

Don Sturzo wrote: "The Austria of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg pretends to be a Catholic State founded upon the Encyclical Quadragesimo Anno, but in reality it is a dictatorial State with a Catholic and Fascist predominance; the government represents only a minority and is staying in power only on the ground of martial law. The social measures inspired by papal Encyclicals are not realities . . . the masses of the workers have not forgotten the bloody repression of February 1934."

And finally, there is the opinion expressed in *The Catholic World* (June 1938) concerning "the disastrous psychological consequences . . . which Austria never lived down. A 'Christian' state had waded in blood, and such a state is a contradiction in terms." The writer of the foregoing lines is Mr. Shuster himself. Does he not agree with Don Sturzo, Prince Loewenstein, and the present writer that the very fact that Dollfuss insisted his regime was Catholic and waded in blood under the Catholic banner has hurt the Catholic Church—not only in Austria, but throughout the world?

Nor will the Hitler Austrian chapter improve the democratic world's opinion of the hierarchy. In the spring of

1938, after Hitler had for years persecuted the Catholic Church in Germany, the Catholic hierarchy of Austria, a free state, 90 per cent Catholic, insisted that Catholics vote "Ja" for annexation. Vienna Catholics were shocked when Hitler's *Voelkischer Beobachter* appeared (March 28, 1938) with a facsimile of the letter Cardinal Innitzer wrote to Nazi organizer Buerckel saying the Austrian bishops' declaration for the plebiscite would initiate a new period of co-operation between the Austrian Catholics and Nationalist Socialists. Above his signature the cardinal had written "Heil Hitler." The bishops' declaration was read from all the pulpits of Austria. It said in part:

We joyfully recognize that the National Socialist movement has produced pre-eminent accomplishments . . . particularly for the poorer classes.

We are also convinced that the National Socialist movement will avert the danger of atheistic and destructive Communism. The bishops bless this activity. . . .

The Catholic hierarchy of Austria not only was in politics, but had also declared itself for Nazism. It is true that the following day the Holy See said in its *Osservatore Romano* that the Austrian Episcopacy had acted without its knowledge or consent, and that same evening a broadcast was made from the Vatican station addressing the Austrian bishops and others who "short-sightedly join the victorious of the day," but when an attempt was made by anti-Anschluss leaders to use these Vatican misgivings against the bishops' expressed instructions, the Vatican itself surrendered. Its semiofficial statement said, "the broadcasts made last evening from the Vatican station in the German language concerning political Catholicism in relation to the Austrian situation, had a private character and was made without previous con-

sultation with the State secretariat. . . . The fact that the broadcast coincided with the *Osservatore Romano's* assertion that the Holy See was not consulted on the Austrian episcopate's pro-Nazi declaration, was purely fortuitous. . . ."

Three days before the voting the Roman Catholic churches of Austria raised the swastika flag. On plebiscite day every newspaper and news agency reported that the Catholic clergy took an active part in getting out the pro-Hitler vote. "Jesuit fathers at Feldkirch in Vorarlberg unanimously voted 'Yes,' demonstratively refusing to enter booths to cast secret ballots." Yet, at that time, it had already been decreed that the Catholic labor unions, the women's organizations, the Catholic Youth, the Catholic University League and other Catholic organizations were to be abolished when Hitler took over, and the municipal council decided that on the pedestal for the proposed statue of the late Catholic leader Dollfuss, the bust of his murderer, Planetta, should be placed.

The year had not passed before the mob in Vienna (a Catholic city) was storming the palace of Cardinal Innitzer and shouting "Death to the Black Dog" and "To Dachau with Innitzer." Promptly the Nazi commissioner, Buerckel, issued a statement blaming the "Communists." But this was found to be the usual Fascist lie. Herr Buerckel then announced that "Czechs and Jews" were to blame. But this too was proved a lie. So when the excitement had worn low, Nazi officials admitted it was the first skirmish in the war against the Catholic Church in Austria. At the end of 1938, Nazi district leader Odilo Globocnik announced that in the eleven weeks following the attack on Innitzer about 52,000 had been persuaded to leave the Catholic Church. He was very angry at the archbishop of Vienna. "The Cardinal tried recently to dabble in politics," he said. Early in 1939 it was reported that "gradually the whole enormous wealth of the

Catholic Church of the former Austria is getting into possession of the State." The Nazis said the Church had been the largest landowner in the Ostmark and its present possessions were valued at not less than \$100,000,000. Property was not being confiscated "in the literal sense," but Nazi commissioners were in charge. The Nazis promised to show a profit on the thirty-six large Vienna buildings, blocks of apartments and shops, belonging to the Vienna archbishopric, which were being operated at a loss. At Kalksburg, ten miles from Vienna, Catholic schools were closed, the buildings converted into army barracks. On May 12, 1939, the Church authorities of Austria were notified that in the future all changes in the personnel of the clergy would be subject to Nazi approval.

This is the modern history of the Vatican and Austria: first, a Catholic state under Franz-Joseph; then a republic frequently ruled by Catholics; then a Catholic Corporate Fascist State, and finally a Nazi dictatorship which is quickly destroying the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, on all occasions, the Catholic hierarchy and spokesmen for the Church continue to declare that their worst enemy is Communism. They continue to prefer Fascism.

2. PORTUGAL: CATHOLIC AND CORPORATIVE

Only a certain few Catholic writers claim that Portugal is not a Fascist dictatorship.

Michael Kenny, S.J., calls Portugal a state of democratic peace, order, and prosperity; he praises a country which has abolished the right to strike, the foremost weapon of labor, the most important means by which labor has improved its standards of living; he thinks highly of a country which has abolished political parties; yet he claims Portugal is not

totalitarian or dictatorial, but merely authoritarian and corporative.

The head of the State (he writes²) is the president of the Republic, who is elected by national suffrage for seven years. He is empowered to dissolve the chambers and appoint and dismiss the various ministers, who are responsible only to him; . . . and, under certain restrictions, to veto legislation and postpone elections. . . .

The Constitution absolutely prohibits strikes and lockouts, and threats thereof, by individuals and corporations, on the ground that since the administration of justice belongs to the state, disputes on employment and wages and related matters must be settled, not by private warfare, but by the constituted public organs of justice and equity. . . .

Thus the *Estado Novo's* Constitution emphasizes: 1) Personal authority and responsibility of President to people and Prime Minister to President; 2) Elimination of political parties and partisan politics; 3) Legislative discussion and expert advice by the Corporative Chamber on the merits of proposed laws instead of party commitments; 4) Checks on Presidential veto by the Council of State, by a two-thirds Assembly majority, by power of emergency legislation, by the electoral laws, and by a ten-year revision of the Constitution. *The whole system is, in effect, an applied resume of Catholic political philosophy and of the Papal Encyclicals on government.* It steers clear of "liberal" individualism on the one hand, and, on the other, of State omnipotence and absolute paternalism and of Communist or Fascist collectivism. . . . Meanwhile he (Salazar) is making wider conquests. His government has given its best aid to its brother Nationalists of Spain against the assassins of Christian liberty.

A considerable discussion of Portugal has been published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. The Rev. Richard S. Devane, S.J., also claiming that the government works on

² *The Sign*, May 1937.

Catholic principles, mentions with approval the suppression of Freemasonry and admits that the present magnificent results could not be achieved without the army. What has held Portugal back in the past, says Father Devane, has been "the blind adoption of the complete application of the pagan principles of the French Revolution—Liberal Democracy, with its deification of the individual, its laicisation of the State, of Marriage, of Education, in a word, of the whole life of the nation. The political instrument by which the State and the people were exploited and enslaved was, as in France, Grand Orient Freemasonry. The latter-day logical development of this nefarious secular philosophy has been Atheistic Communism, which has appeared wherever Liberalism has spread." But Salazar has known how to deal with "these poisonous social doctrines," he has rejected liberalism, which, according to Salazar (in the preface of his *Collected Addresses*), "does not exist and has never existed; philosophically speaking it is nonsense, and in the political order it is a lie."

Father Devane points out that Salazar insists the State should not be the chief educational force, that the duty of education rests on the family first, and that the Church has its place also. Many of Salazar's speeches on materialism, on the relationship of Church and State, on the attack on Communism, read like the papal encyclicals which have inspired them in part. "It is absolutely unique," says Father Devane, "to hear the head of a modern European State (who by the way, is usually described by the Press as a 'Fascist Dictator' of a 'Totalitarian State'), using the language of a Papal Encyclical and pleading for the full acceptance of spiritual values."

Dictator Salazar himself has stated his policy as follows: "Liberalism, Materialism, Class Warfare or Internationalism have no place whatever in our regime or in our land. They

are rejected by the national mentality, by the laws, by public and private institutions, in a word by the life of the nation." These horrible ideas—liberalism among them—do try to enter Portugal, but the brave dictator declares that he is constantly on guard and always making war upon them. There is only one man who has done more than himself to prevent the spread of ideas, and that man is Hitler, and Salazar therefore bows his head.

"We are, therefore [he says], by force of our intelligence and common sense also anti-communists, and we hold that gratitude is due to the head of the German Government and State for the defence of civilization, achieved by him in his victory over Communism in Germany."

And, it must be noted, this famous statement was not made in 1933, when Herr Hitler was murdering only his own political enemies, but in 1937; it was republished with the gentle dictator's approval in the *Diario de Manhã* on June 3, 1937, at a time Hitler's persecution of the Catholics was already one of his main lines of offense.

In applauding Salazar, Father Devane is particularly anxious to emphasize the attack on liberalism, which he calls a "poison"; he refers to "the social, political and economic system of Liberalism often times camouflaged as 'Democracy,'" and insists that "one of the pressing needs of the hour is a history of Liberalism from the Catholic point of view, showing its evolution and development from the religious liberalism of the so-called 'Reformation,'" and he finally condemns the philosophy which is the backbone of all democratic nations because "Liberalism has ever attacked the unity, stability and dignity of matrimony, by introducing divorce."

Next to abolishing the rights of labor and political parties, banning Freemasonry, and ending liberalism, Portugal's greatest achievement has been called its "balanced" budget.

In reviewing one of the many propaganda books in praise of Salazar, my colleague, T. R. Ybarra, in the *New York Times*, accepts the statement of the book writer that the budget remains balanced and that "the solemn London *Times*, which is not given to lyrical praise of anybody or anything, wrote of Salazar's regime: 'It is impossible to deny that the economic improvement recorded in Portugal since 1928 is not only without parallel anywhere else in the world, but is an achievement for which history can show but few precedents!'"

One of the greatest frauds of the Twentieth Century is the so-called balanced budget of the Italian Fascist State under Mussolini. Financiers, historians, and even the magazine *Fortune* have proved that the Italian budget is not balanced, it is merely tricked out to fool the people, and the simplest of all frauds has been its division into two parts, one labeled "ordinary" which shows a fine surplus, the other labeled "extraordinary," which shows an overwhelming deficit, but which is not counted. Professor Salvemini of Harvard has published a complete analysis of this business, which shows that Italy under Fascism has sunk into debt at a faster rate than under liberal premiers.

If President Roosevelt were to divide the American budget into two parts, setting aside the three or four billion dollars which are spent for relief annually as "extraordinary," and not include them, he also would have a balanced budget, but it is doubtful if it would impress the Republican party and the Republican press.

Yet this is what Mussolini did in 1925, and what Salazar did in 1928 *et seq.*

It is significant that in the very years Salazar and his propaganda volunteers were boasting of a balanced budget, the League of Nations financial experts, using official Portu-

guese figures, were showing annual deficits. For example, the Salazar claim of a surplus of 1,504 contos (about \$75,000) in the 1934-35 budget was shown, by League of Nations experts, to be a deficit of 280,000 contos, or about \$14,000,000.

And as for the *London Times*, my colleague should know that it too gets out special propaganda editions for various governments, including the Portuguese, and that it supported Hitler for a long time, that it was in favor of the Munich settlement, the dismemberment of the Czechoslovak democracy, and generally on the reactionary side in European and American affairs.

Portugal is a Fascist dictatorship. It is true that it differs slightly from its colleagues. It does not fight the Catholic Church, as Mussolini and Hitler do; in fact, it supports the Church, and in faith and morals follows the rules of the Church. It is not a one-man dictatorship. Portugal is ruled by three men: General Carmona, Fascist dictator; Oliveira Salazar, Jesuit pupil, premier and assistant dictator, and Cardinal Emanuele Goncalves Cerejeira. Portugal is a "corporative state" with a constitution allegedly based on papal encyclicals, and written under the aegis of the cardinal. Under the rule of these three men Portugal remains what it was during the monarchy: a land of illiteracy, misery, exploitation of the people with the standard of living⁴ the lowest in Europe, and liberty and democracy almost nonexistent. There is not only an occasional bloody purge, but also the constant pressure of Fascist terrorism.

If it were true that Salazar had balanced the budget, it would have been with the blood of his people. The cost of living has increased about 40 per cent under the dictatorship, but real wages are no higher. The Salazar espionage system

⁴The last League of Nations figure for standards of living showed that Italy in 1931 was tied for last place with Portugal.

costs five million dollars annually, which is four times that of the entire British Empire, according to Charles Duff, British Foreign Office expert on Spain and Portugal.

There is the usual Fascist terrorism to keep the working people in control. "Political prisoners," writes Duff,⁵ "are tortured in a manner which prevailed during the Inquisition. . . . The present writer has no desire to make the flesh of his readers creep by recounting the star chamber methods employed by that devout Catholic Salazar. As reported⁶ by those who suffered, they include thumb-screws, burning of the soles of the feet, squeezing the head in bookpresses, hanging by wrists and ankles, nude imprisonment in temperatures below zero, and walking in a circle until the prisoner drops. Nor is Salazar altogether behind the times in regard to science: he uses an electric chair to provide shocks at recurrent intervals for the prisoners who may be a little more strong-minded than the average. . . ."

Portugal, ruled by a college professor, of whom an advance in education might be expected, remains 55 per cent illiterate. Nor is it the government's policy to enlighten the people. Says Salazar: "In the newspapers I often read this pitiful sentence: 'The people must be taught to read,' and I say to myself, 'What shall they read?' It is education and undesirable literature, these are our enemies."

In the Spanish War the Portuguese government aligned itself with all the Fascist countries which aided Franco. The government, the bureaucracy, the re-established Jesuit order, the landowners and all their dependents and about half the population of Lisbon and Oporto were for Franco. The mass of peasantry, illiterate and nonpolitical, was indifferent. But there was one element for the Loyalists: the intellectuals,

⁵ Being a member of the Foreign Office, he used the name Carlos Prieto.

⁶ H. G. Doody, *Time & Tide*, Sept. 12, 1936.

professors, teachers, the industrial workers, the few enlightened peasants, and the other half of the Lisbon and Oporto populations. The police and spy machinery was on Franco's side.

Like its Fascist colleagues, Portugal also lied about its official participation in the Spanish War. But this must be said to its credit, it dropped the pretense of nonintervention during the war; nevertheless, even the Loyalists did not realize until the Portuguese troops returned that Salazar had sent as many as eighteen thousand men to Spain.

Portugal was also guilty of participation in one of the worst atrocities of the war. On August 14, 1936, and in the following days, the frontier police, on orders from Lisbon, returned to Badajos thirty-one Spaniards including teachers, lawyers, industrialists, a stonemason, a metal worker, and the secretary and members of labor unions, whom Franco promptly executed. Nicolás de Pablo, a member of the Spanish parliament, and Sinforiano Madronero, mayor of Badajos, were held two days at Campo Major, then returned for execution. Moreover, the Portuguese government also sent to Badajos numerous Portuguese political prisoners for the purpose of having them murdered by the Spanish Fascists.⁷

The Spanish uprising was planned on Portuguese soil. It is generally believed that the airplane which was taking General Sanjurjo from Portugal to Spain, where he was to lead the rebellion, was sabotaged by a Portuguese anti-Fascist. In the summer of 1936 all communications between

⁷ Father Thorning denies there was a massacre of 2,000 Spanish workmen at Badajos. Jay Allen of the *Chicago Tribune* went to Badajos, found the bull ring still reeking with blood of the dead, saw dead workmen lying in the streets, saw Franco men shooting workmen. Moreover, the Portuguese newspapers *Diário de Noticias*, *Diário de Lisboa* and *Correia da Manhã* had correspondents with Franco who witnessed the massacre and reported it. One Catholic journalist, Francis McCullagh, also admits the massacre (*The Sign*, November 1936), although he calls the victims Communists.

the Franco and de Llano armies passed through the Hotel Aviz in Lisbon, with the approval of Salazar. The entire banking business of the rebels at first was done by the Bank of Portugal and the Bank of the Holy Spirit, a Catholic institution, with the consent and approval of the Portuguese Fascist dictator.

Of the two nations organized on the Catholic Corporative Plan, Austria and Portugal, the former was founded in bloodshed and ended in bloodshed, and the latter must be judged by the tests of civilization: are the people better off materially; is culture progressing? The answer, in League of Nations and other unbiased reports, is that Portugal sinks lower and lower in standard of living annually, and civilization fails under Fascism there as in all countries.

CHAPTER 12

The Church in Canada and Latin America

EACH important subdivision of the New World offers different Catholic problems of utmost importance to the United States and to the European powers now again engaged in war.

In Catholic Canada the liaison with Fascism is open and acknowledged. In Mexico the war between Church and state continues with recurrent periods of violence and compromise. And in Latin America, where the United States is making its only fight against the Fascist ideology, the triumph of General Franco in Spain, with the aid of the Catholic Church and Fascist mercenaries and machines, has made the battle for democracy more difficult and involved the Church in paradoxical situations.

1. CLERICO-FASCISM IN CANADA

The popular press, daily, weekly and monthly, has in the recent past published alarming news of the spread of Fascism in Canada. There the coalition of German Bundists, Coughlinites, Italian Fascists, and all brands of native reactionaries has almost been accomplished, whereas in the United States a Fascist union under the leadership of General George Van Horn Moseley is still an unfulfilled dream of the enemies of democracy. The popular press, in telling the sensational news from Canada, however, omitted one fact: the participation of the Catholic hierarchy in the

coalition. Fear of a Catholic reader boycott has caused this censorship. Nevertheless in Canada there is no secrecy surrounding the co-operation of the announced Fascists led by Adrien Arcand, the reactionaries who refuse to accept the Fascist title, the hierarchy under Cardinal Villeneuve, and the political leaders of Quebec.

In Catholic Quebec the German Nazis, who persecute Catholics at home, are co-operating with Catholic politicians and propagandists, carrying on a campaign against not only the Jews but also democracy and the United States. The Japanese and the Italians also help in this work. Nor is the movement purely propagandistic. Former Premier R. B. Bennett has found evidence that Nazis have imported a large supply of war materials from Chicago.

Adrien Arcand's National Social Christian Party claims 23,000 members in Ontario, 150,000 in the Dominion. The Casa d'Italia and the Deutsche Bund headquarters in Montreal attack the policies of the United States, disseminate anti-British propaganda, and unite with Arcand in Jew-baiting and Red-baiting. This is the open Fascist movement in Canada, and need concern us no more than the lunatic fringe Fascists of the United States. But there is considerable evidence of the co-operation of the State, Church and Big Business with the Arcand movement.

Fascism did not arrive in French Canada with the Duplessis government. It has been growing slowly ever since the World War, when the nationalistic desire for independence was so strong that even a union of France and Great Britain was not emotionally powerful enough to persuade French-Canadians to volunteer for the struggle against the common enemy. French Canada has not followed France, the motherland, into republicanism and anticlericalism; it remains Bourbon France, with a reactionary outlook on life. The French-Canadian peasants, says Teeling, were restrained

from going to fight for France by their parish priests, for fear that these innocents, "brought up to look back on the France of the 18th Century as the ideal religious country, centering around its square and its parish priest," would be disillusioned by the modernity and liberalism of French republican life, and because "the authority of the priest is almost supreme," the youth of Quebec stayed at home.

The undying nationalistic movement naturally turned more and more Fascist after the war as the lines between right and left became more distinct. The depression of 1930 did not skip the province, and as it deepened, M. Taschereau made it his plan to direct discontent "into Fascist channels and to provide the people with scapegoats lest they come to see where the real evil lies." It was then that anti-Semitism was encouraged. "Four and a half years of depression, in fact," wrote J. E. Keith in *The Canadian Forum* (April 1934), "have done little else than reveal how harmonious are the relations between the three persons in the provincial trinity—the Liberal Party machine, the Roman Church, and St. James street (Big Business). Scarcely a rift has appeared to disturb the equilibrium of the theo-pluto-bureaucracy. . . . The totalitarian state could hardly be more united. . . ." The suppression of freedom of speech was ruthless and persistent; no attempt was made to lessen the gross inequalities of wealth by fairer taxation; and M. Taschereau supported the dictatorship of private ownership in industry and especially the public utilities in which he had a personal interest. From the pulpits the priests denounced the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and everything radical which might threaten the economic privileges and "great investments of the Church not only in lands but in utilities and the industrial stocks and bonds."

The French-Canadian reads nothing which is not approved by the authorities and knows very little of the criticism of

fundamental economic conditions which is the common knowledge of the English Canadian. And when someone rebels, as did Albert St. Martin, and tries to enlighten the peasantry, he is taken into court, charged with sedition, blasphemy, and other offenses. If he is freed, his workers' university (Université Ouvrière) is raided and he is clubbed into submission by French hooligans while the police stand by and applaud.

On the other hand, a movement to create an independent French Canadian Catholic republic is permitted. The Abbé Groulx, in his pamphlet *Jeunesses Patriotes*, speaks of freedom from the foreign yoke, a phrase easily interpreted as treason to the British rule, but no action is taken. The movement plans a Catholic corporative state. "The parliamentary regime can lead us only to ruin," says *L'Indépendance*, "because it requires the existence of parties which dissipate our national energies." Democracy is to be replaced with "the centralization of power, wherever it may be necessary, in the person of the man who will impose himself and who will symbolize the spiritual unity of the factory, the municipality, the district, or the nation." The big trusts and the chain stores are to be liquidated—just as Hitler promised petty bourgeois Germany—and professional men and the priesthood would rule. The Catholic corporative state would be anti-Semitic. "*C'est un malaise universel qui n'a qu'une source: le libéralisme juif,*" says a writer in *L'Indépendance*.

In 1937 the St. Jean Baptiste Society began to organize a corporative system under the direction of its Committee of Economic Defense. One of its spokesmen, Victor Barbeau, professor in the University of Montreal, speaking to the junior Chambre de Commerce, said:¹ "Let us interrogate ourselves on the fate of democracy and its most lamentable expression, liberalism . . . When we have succeeded in

¹ *La Presse*, February 24, 1937.

setting up Corporatism in our social relations, we must then establish it in the domain of public affairs." This campaign for corporatism had the support of the cardinal because it was called an antidote for Communism, about which a great hullabaloo was being made, although the Church knew it barely existed.

The Catholic trade unions of French Canada are unlike the trade unions in the United States, many of which are directed by liberal Catholics. In Canada the clergy control the unions and their policy is to "love and agree with" the bosses, never to strike except as a last means, and never at all in the public utilities, in which leading politicians and the Church have considerable investments.

On April 10, 1937, the Ligue Catholique des Ouvrieres de l'Industrie de l'Aiguille de la Province de Quebec and La Federation Nationale du Vetement announced an agreement with the manufacturers; they had asked for weekly wages of \$8 to \$14, but the I. L. G. W. U., then a C. I. O. union, insisted on a wage of \$12.50 to \$30, and called a strike. Whereupon the Church authorities supported the Catholic unions and branded the C. I. O. as Communist. They paid no attention to the fact that the Catholic unions had broken the law in permitting a wage lower than that provided in section 10-A set by the Minimum Wage Commission. It is an undeniable fact that whereas the C. I. O. in the United States and the Church are on friendly terms, in Canada the hierarchy is fighting it and other international unions.²

The French Canadian peasant or industrial worker is an exploited person and does not realize, thanks to his leaders and his press, that his problem is largely an economic one.

² Cf. *The Canadian Forum*, and Duncan Aikman's articles in *The New York Post*, February, 1938.

The natural resources of the province are in the hands of British and American capitalists, and the profits go abroad. Therefore, whenever the situation becomes acute, the Fascists raise the specter of "Jewish control" of money and the Church the specter of "Communist intrigue." Neither is true or pertinent to the Canadian situation, but since all the means of communication and enlightenment are closed, the peasant and proletarian have nothing but blind guidance toward Fascist reaction.

In the riots during the Spanish war, even the university students showed the effect of the propaganda of falsehood and hatred. In October, 1936, a mob shouting, "*A bas les communistes*" and "*A bas les Apostates*," and sometimes singing *O Canada*, smashed the windows of Jewish shops, beat up a liberal professor of McGill, and threatened the *Montreal Star* and *Montreal Herald*. But instead of denouncing this breach of law and order, Mr. Duplessis, premier and attorney general, said,³ "*Le procureur general félicite ensuite hautement les étudiants de l'Université de Montréal pour leur contre-manifestation. . . . Je vous dire ici combien de fierte j'ai éprouvée lorsque j'ai appris que les étudiants avaient empêché les communistes de parler à Montréal. . . .*" The premier was taking a purely Hitlerian stand. He was approving the mob's violation of the constitutional right of free speech. In the mind of the mob, including the University student mob, Socialists, Communists, Jews, Freemasons are already "outlaws," and Protestants, Liberals, Democrats and the British not far removed from this category.

Meeting after meeting has been canceled, suppressed, or broken up. Naturally, all who supported Spain, the C. I. O., labor in general, liberalism in general, were subversive or communistic in the eyes of the reactionaries. *L'Action*

³ *Le Canada*, October 26, 1936.

Catholique, organ of the hierarchy, deplored the fact "the sower of subversive ideas . . . is free to perorate at his ease," but it declared itself "passably indifferent between democracy and Fascism"; the St. Jean Baptiste Society congratulated the students who violently suppressed Loyalist meetings; the Comité des oeuvres Catholique did likewise; the Association Canadienne de la Jeunesse Catholique thanked the mayor for violating the law in suppressing a meeting; but the most outrageous action of all was taken by Cardinal Villeneuve who, on hearing that the mayor had banned a meeting because one of its speakers was a Communist member of the French Chamber of Deputies, answered a protest from the Civil Liberties Union, as follows:

Freedom of speech, yes, but not freedom to insult our social conceptions, our traditions, our morals and our religion. Freedom of speech, I am for it, but let it be among decent people, not among imbeciles and brigands. . . . Would you let sufferers from contagious diseases poison the air you breathe? . . . Together with his Excellency the Archbishop-Coadjutor of Montreal, I praise the youth which aligns itself to protect special order. . . .

If it is argued that this is contrary to law, I reply that before law there is the Law of Nature. . . . Well, to defend ourselves against subversive doctrines, against spiritual poisoning, against the overthrow of the foundations of civilization, against the dynamite which would blow up our religious, family and social traditions, if that is not the law, let that law be made; if not, we shall exercise the law and right of nature. "The safety of the people is the supreme law" . . . Under pretext of respecting a morbid democracy, people wave at us the spectre of an illusory Fascism, and meanwhile the enemies gain a foothold and make a mockery of our juridical scruples.

His Eminence was critical of those who advocated free speech, hinting that they might be wolves in sheep's cloth-

ing, comparable with the magicians and sorcerers of Scripture, and concluded: "Must we not conclude that Satan, prince of darkness and father of lies, might act in the same fashion?" The cardinal openly placed himself on the side of the students who had taken the law into their own hands and committed violence, and the mayor who had condoned law-breaking. Cardinal Villeneuve would have no difficulty whatever in becoming official archbishop of a Fascist state.

Duplessis always falls back upon the hierarchy when in trouble. When he was taken to task for calling the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation a Communist movement, he replied, "But you should see what Archbishop Gauthier says about the C. C. F.," and when the notorious and most Fascist of all his legislation, the "Padlock Law," went into effect, he excused himself by saying that it was suggested by Cardinal Villeneuve himself. The act outlaws the Communist party, padlocks not only places in which they meet, but also homes in which they live, and could be enforced to padlock the main railroad station if a Communist were there waiting for a train. One of the first results of the law was the searching of baggage of passengers arriving in Quebec who were poorly dressed or "foreign-looking."

But it is more than an anti-Communist measure. Mr. Duplessis was, in fact, asked to define Communism in the bill and refused to do so, saying it could be enforced more effectively without a definition. One of his supporters, the week the law was passed, denounced a proposed Mothers' Pension Bill as "a move towards Communism," and the conservative Canadian correspondent of the *New York Times*, John MacCormac, reporting the Padlock Law against Communism, stated that "Fascism, not Communism however, has generally been considered the greatest threat in the Province." Tons of Nazi literature were being distributed by German Nazis. And according to *The Canadian Forum* (April 1937),

the aim of Cardinal Villeneuve and Mr. Duplessis actually is to brand everything which the hierarchy dislikes as Communist. "The chief activity of Mr. Duplessis," said the *Forum*, "seems to be red-baiting. . . . This is a good example of the working of the ultra-reactionary Catholic mentality in the province, for whom the premier is undoubtedly the spokesman. The more the anti-communist drive gets under way, the clearer it becomes that the danger really feared is anti-clericalism. The enormous wealth and power of the Quebec church, derived from a populace largely poverty stricken and backward, is producing the inevitable discontent, and the ecclesiastical authorities are seeking to justify repression of perfectly legal opposition by dubbing the anti-clerical as communist. It is modern Spain in miniature. We may expect grave disorders in Quebec if this suicidal policy is continued. The *Montreal Standard* of March 13th reported the organizers of the Knights of Columbus in Quebec City as having said that 'if they cannot prevent communist activities by organization, they will resort to force.' Who are the real enemies of law and order now? Such language is clear sedition."

The worst fears of liberty-loving persons were realized in the years following the enforcement of the Padlock Law. Officials of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union were thrown into jail, search and seizure were carried on without warrant or warning. Frank Leone, a delegate to the Canadian Civil Liberties Union meeting, for example, received a visit from the padlock police who confiscated the books of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, Malraux, Sender, Ralph Bates, Duranty, Agnes Smedley, Edgar Snow, Palme Dutt and Bernard Shaw, and all copies of *The Nation*.

Labor leaders and organizers are the most frequent victims of the law, and C.I.O. men in particular. A Ukrainian school in Montreal's Farmer-Labor Temple lost its thousand-volume

library including its Shakespeare and Dickens, and its teachers were warned to discontinue classes in current events. In a raid on the Maxim Gorki school, the beginners' violin class lost its musical instruments as well as books. Under the law the government can any day it wants to raid McGill University and confiscate its library because it contains books on the history of the Russian revolution.

Law or no law, Quebec suffers from a loss of civil liberties, thanks to the co-operation of the hierarchy, Duplessis, and the police. Bookshops selling legal books are impounded; the press is censored; workmen are stopped from organizing; leftist papers are padlocked; meetings are prevented or broken up. The situation is somewhat like that in Jersey City before the Supreme Court curbed the outrageous Mayor Hague, but worse, and there is no court to overrule Quebec's laws.

Here is a sample of Church censorship which Robert Seller quotes in his *The Tragedy of Quebec*: "Having invoked the holy name of God, we condemn, by virtue of Our Authority, the two publications printed in our diocese, to wit, the *Canada Revue* and the *Echo des Deux Montagnes*, and forbid, pending further order, all the faithful under penalty of refusal of the sacraments, to print, to put or to keep on sale, to distribute, to read, to receive or have in possession, these two dangerous journals, or to work for them or encourage them in any manner whatever." Cardinal Villeneuve himself is no believer in freedom of the press because he fears it "accords the license to teach all error, gossip, all calumny, and provide revolutionaries with a means to sing the benefit of revolution." Nor does Cardinal Villeneuve believe in other freedoms. They are not Christian, apparently. "Paganism," said the Cardinal (addressing a Catholic Youth rally, October 30, 1937), "has many offers. Among them are freedom of speech, freedom to insult our traditions,

our beliefs and our religion." The theater also is censored and authors are forced to withdraw books to which Catholic censors object. (Montreal, with more than half a million population, has no public library.)

In an atmosphere of feudal reaction it is the most natural thing for the times to call up a Fascist leader, and several are now trying to play the Hitler role, chief of them being Adrien Arcand.

Arcand is editor of three publications: *L'Illustration Nouvelle*, the Montreal daily, *Le Fascist Canadien* and *Le Patriote*. The first is the official organ in Montreal of Mr. Duplessis, the second the organ of official Fascism. Duplessis has made the statement that he knows nothing about a Fascist movement in the province, although Arcand, his editor, has for years been leading a drilled and uniformed band, and heads an openly Fascist movement. The Church no doubt disclaims any relationship with the Fascist party as such, nevertheless Arcand, Duplessis, Cardinal Villeneuve—and behind them less visibly the big business of St. James Street—are co-operating in every possible way in that social and political action in the province which leads to outright Fascism. Some time ago E. S. McLeod in *The Nation* said, "Fascism in Quebec is based on race, economics, and religion and the greatest of these is religion. Under the direct leadership and inspiration of a branch of the Roman Catholic church that can be compared for obscurantist policy only with the Hierarchies of the more primitive states of Latin America, the politicians of Quebec are directing a fight against 'communism' which is destroying every liberty for which French Canadians as well as British Canadian patriots have worked, fought, and died." *The Commonwealth* objected to the article, especially to the charge that the educational system was designed to keep the people ignorant. "It is untruthful," said *The Commonwealth*, "to indicate that the

Hierarchy there fosters only reaction, obscurantism and Fascism." But the evidence is overwhelming that it does, and there is almost no trace of the hierarchy fostering enlightenment, civil liberties, a free press, tolerance of opposed ideas, the common rights which every citizen of a democracy enjoys.

Arcand insists that "The Catholic Church is not fascist"; he says that for every Catholic who supports his party two are opposed, but the difficulty in uniting Church and Fascism is the Nazi situation. Arcand is with the German Nazis, and the Catholic Church is having trouble in Germany. *Le Fascist Canadien* uses the subscription lists of the French reactionary clerical press to bolster its circulation and gain members for the Fascist party. Incidentally, *Le Patriote* and *Le Fascist Canadien* publish the same falsehoods and forgeries which all the German, Italian and American pro-Fascist and anti-Semitic weeklies obtain from the same German sources.

Arcand is for a Catholic corporative state; the hierarchy in Canada and the National Catholic Labor Syndicates, 40,000 strong, are also for it; and Paul Bouchard, editor of *La Nation*, and Arcand's rival as a Fascist leader, wants to duplicate the Mussolini rather than the Salazar system of government. Bouchard makes no distinction between the Italian Corporate State and Catholic corporatism and there is indeed little difference, except that in the former the politicians rule and may antagonize the Church, and in the latter Church and state are one, and in the Church's control. Says Bouchard: ⁴ "French Canada has got to establish the institutions of the corporative state . . . Benito Mussolini is the greatest man of modern times . . . Fascism is the political application of corporatism." The favor Bouchard

⁴ An excellent series of articles first bringing the Fascist movement in Canada to the attention of the American public was written by Duncan Aikman in the *New York Post* in February, 1938.

enjoys among a large section of Quebec Province Roman Catholic clergy, says Aikman, "derives, in fact, precisely from the fact that his movement promises a definite place for the Church as a participating body in the government and a restoration of medieval piety. . . ."

The Federation des Syndicats Catholiques is for the corporate state and has organized Italian-style syndicates in which the bosses and workers participate. In Italy this serfdom was forced on labor, in Canada it is voluntary. Alfred Charpentier, president, is willing to let the clergy run the unions. "The priests, because of their broadened experience," said Charpentier, "know more about the labor problem than the young workers." The priests, however, have led the fight against the C.I.O., and neither ethically nor fairly. They refer to it usually as "Red," "Communist," or "International." For example, Father Henri Fortier of Kenogami, delivered himself thus to his congregation:

The International (C.I.O.) puts aside Jesus Christ and his religion.

The International disrespects the social doctrine of the Church. In the International it is Communism which you favor. It is Freemasonry you help. It is revolution which you are preparing.

I warn certain members of the International who are at the same time Freemasons and Communists that if they continue to insult the Catholic Syndicate, the clergy, as members of the syndicates, without delay will take means to be respected.

Not only the C.I.O. but also other organizations, said Father Fortier, lead to "a disastrous promiscuousness for Catholics"—namely, the Y.M.C.A., the Y.W.C.A., the Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, Elks and the American Federation of Labor.

There are of course liberal priests who are opposed to all the reactionary political and social programs of their col-

leagues, but they are neither spokesmen nor leaders. The cardinal is a reactionary, the hierarchy is reactionary, Duplessis, Arcand, Bouchard, and their press, political parties and labor unions are united in making Quebec the blackest province in North America.

2. LATIN AMERICA; A. MEXICO

If we accept Mussolini's definition of Fascism as Reaction, then Latin America has been Fascist long before the Duce, or his Socialist father, was born. The Diaz dictatorship in Mexico, established by a radical who betrayed his party and sold his country piecemeal to the oil and mining interests, and various Central and South American dictatorships, could easily serve as models for similar present-day regimes.

The Mexican dictatorship was destroyed by the democratic people of Mexico, the impoverished farmers, the peons, the intellectuals and a few military men. The Church, according to a formula easy to carry out until such times as revolts are led by pro-Church reactionaries, stood by the government in power in the twentieth century, just as it had stood by the constituted authorities in the nineteenth. But when the Church aligned itself with the enemy of the people, *i.e.*, constituted government, as it had done in Spain and other countries, it was no surprise to find in Mexico a Catholic people attacking a Catholic church when it at last rose against its political and financial slave drivers.

In fairness to the Church, it may be said that government reprisals have been too severe, that the laws passed against it too harsh, that their prosecution approached persecution. There are of course two sides to the Mexican question, and it was for the purpose of studying them objectively that the present writer went to Mexico in 1927, at a time the Catholics in America were clamoring for a war of annexation,

the *Chicago Tribune* and other superpatriots were screaming for the same action for other purposes; big business was willing to fight another war for democracy, or oil; and the Catholic press was saying that only the Mexican government's position was getting publicity in the United States.

The liberal *Commonweal* demanded that the newspaper correspondents in Mexico do their duty and supply the facts; it was distressed to note the "inert indifference" with which the American press had "accepted the exile or the gagging of its correspondents" and published "whatever the Calles government offered it for consumption." The Jesuit organ *America* said the press "does not try to find out and publish the facts," "displays no curiosity as to what is happening in Mexico," and "absolutely refuses to consider publication of the facts as attested by an experienced and impartial newspaperman." *America* suspected the "unseen powers."

Pope Pius XI, also under the propaganda-made impression that the reporters in Mexico favored the anticlerical government, addressed the American press, saying his voice had been raised "to tell the truth about Mexico to the world, but the carefully laid plans of the persecutors of the Church have prevented it being heard by all in its entirety; indeed sometimes it has not been understood at all. . . ."

It was therefore a great surprise for the present writer to find that the American press corps in Mexico City, consisting of nine or ten Americans, only one a professed Catholic, was, with one or two exceptions, sympathetic with the Catholics and even with the Cristeros, or Catholic partisans who were conducting a guerrilla warfare in the mountains against the government.

"I am not neutral; if you had lived in Mexico as long as I, you would not be neutral," one of the Hearst correspondents told me. "I am hoping for victory for the rebels

in three months," said another member of the corps. One representative of the *New York Times*, whose name was later brought into the hearings of the forged Mexican documents bought by a Hearst man and published in the Hearst press, said: "There is only one side to the Mexican question: we are all anti-Calles." One of the correspondents of the United Press, a youth who had a pocketful of the forgeries, said, "I'll blow this government to pieces when I get out." Another correspondent had married into a wealthy Catholic family and was antigovernment because of religious reasons, but almost the entire American press corps was pro-Catholic because it was anti-Calles, and anti-Calles because it was on the side of the landlords, the mine owners, and the oil operators. There were therefore no grounds for the editorials in *The Commonweal* and *America*, and the accusations made by the Pope, so far as the newspapermen in Mexico are concerned. And so far as the editorial policy of American newspapers is concerned, it is notorious that the entire Hearst press, the *Chicago Tribune*, and other big circulation dailies—while not pro-Catholic—were decidedly anti-Calles, interventionist, annexationist, anti-Mexican.

An example of how well the press corps sent out news to favor the Catholics was an episode during my visit in April, 1927,⁵ when a censorship was suddenly put on outgoing telegrams, and the government issued short reports concerning the surprise attack on a train in which one hundred men, women and children were killed. The Mexicans themselves were not shocked because it was only in the large number of dead that this atrocity differed from many others in the religious war which followed government action against the Church and Archbishop Orozco's raising the standard of revolt. President Calles, announcing the censorship, made

⁵ Fully reported in *You Can't Print That*, pages 315-391.

the sensational charge that the attack on the train was led by three priests.

The American press corps was in a quandary. It knew that this statement, if true, would shock people in the United States. Two journalists expressed doubt about the priests, but a third, who had a relative on the train who had just arrived with the dead and wounded, confirmed the official statement that priests were present at the attack. So the American journalists, gathering informally at the Western Union telegraph office, decided not to play up the fact that priests participated in the massacre of a hundred Catholic soldiers and civilians in the undeclared religious war in the mountains. If any criticism of the press corps was justified, it was that it sent biased news, favoring the Catholics incidentally, in order to harm the Calles regime and support the business interests.

Calles in 1927 was the hope of the democratic world. No one then believed the rumors about his subservience to the big business interests, about the personal fortune he was building, as Diaz and the other dictators built before him; no one suspected that he would betray the Mexican revolution.

Because Calles was intensely anticlerical he was called a Mohammedan, a Freemason, a Bolshevik, the head of the Third Internationale in America, a conspirator with Lenin and Trotsky for the establishment of a Red Regime in Latin America. (He was also called the only honest man in Mexico and the nation's messiah.) He ruled democratically until the spring of 1927 when the Catholics rebelled and fought the Federal troops at Ocatlan, in the State of Jalisco; and then, hearing the priests had led and fought with firearms, he called in the editors of *Universal* and *Excelsior* and handed them an official statement, saying:

"You will print this statement, without change, without

editorial comment, and without any headlines whatever. In case you want any headlines, you may set the first paragraph in large type. Otherwise no change, no comment."

Then to the astonished editors he said: "Gentlemen, I accept no protests. From this day the presidency of Mexico ends: the dictatorship of Mexico begins."

The first act of dictatorship usually is suppression of the newspapers, or their corruption. Calles established a censorship because, he said, the hierarchy in the capital was sending military instructions to the rebels in Jalisco and other states.

The archbishops and bishops in Mexico City, previously forced to register with the police, were now deported. Hundreds of priests were put under surveillance. Of an estimated 4,000 priests in the capital, a thousand fled or were exiled. Following the train massacre Calles called in his chief supporters, the labor council, who accepted his plan:

1. To put priests on all trains in the war zone.
2. To discharge all Knights of Columbus in government posts.
3. To expropriate all the Knights.
4. To take over *Universal* and *Excelsior* because all their stock was owned by the Catholic Church or its sympathizers.
5. To recruit so-called "Red and Black" battalions from the ranks of labor, for a final battle between Church and State.

The civil war in Mexico was, in a small way, similar to the great civil war which was to follow in Spain a decade later. In both instances the priests were on the side of the rebels, and in both, the rebels, flying the flag of the Lord Jesus Christ, killed many Christians. There were in Mexico, as in Spain later, members of the hierarchy who deplored bloodshed and murder and tried to make peace. One of them was Archbishop Leopoldo Ruiz y Flores of Michoacan, acting secretary of the episcopate after the deportation of Arch-

bishop Diaz. Although he was "in hiding," a mutual friend, a journalist, took me to his house, and in this way I was able to act as intermediary in a peace plan he had prepared. Archbishop Ruiz was a quiet-spoken, tolerant, liberal priest. He saw the situation as an impasse, because neither Calles nor the Church could retreat from a definite position, therefore hope rested in the election of General Obregon. Already, the archbishop said, tremendous pressure was being brought upon Obregon by the American State Department, and an early settlement, favorable to the Pope, could be expected. Obregon was later assassinated by a religious fanatic, but years of peace and conflict have alternated, just as they do in Italy, because in certain fundamental things Church and State can never agree.

On returning to Chicago at the end of May, 1927, I was asked to report to the Secretary of State on conditions in Mexico, and later, to write a report to Mr. Green of the A. F. of L. Here are paragraphs concerning the Church-State conflict:

I will not attempt to express an opinion as to who is right. But you must realize that the Catholic Church of Mexico is no more like the Catholic Church of the United States than the latter is like the Mohammedan church. The Mexican masses are but half Christianized. They are more than half pagan. They worship Catholic saints with the same excitement and the same ritual they worshipped Quetzlcoatl. . . .

The Church in Mexico has since the year 1520 or so been engaged in temporal affairs. The church has been on one side or the other in every war and rebellion. Hidalgo and Morelos I believe were priests who fought for the masses; in other wars as in the wars against Diaz, the church supported the Spanish rulers. But the fact I must emphasize is that *the church has participated in every war*. The Calles regime also blames the Church for the terrible ignorance and poverty of the country

at present and for its indulgence of chattel slavery, peonage, and all the horrors of the past 400 years. . . . The Church and Calles both have acted without moderation. Fanaticism features both sides. . . . Arnulfo Gomez, governor of Vera Cruz, is the anti-Calles candidate for president. He is backed by the Catholics and the American oil interests. The big American oil companies are supplying the money. The K. of C., according to one of their Mexico City men, will supply an unlimited amount. However, I do not believe much in Gomez or other factions. . . . Obregon has 18,000 (men) of an army of 20,000. . . .

Volumes could be (and have been ⁶) written of the conflict between Church and State in Mexico. History tells of noble priests who led the people in peace and war, who fought as soldiers and died as martyrs, but history also tells of the hierarchy supporting the tyrants, the landowners, the mine owners, the oil interests. History will probably record the civil war in Spain in a similar manner: the hierarchy supporting the landowners, the army and the tyrant, a few heroic priests risking suspension and excommunication by taking the side of the poor.

Hidalgo and Morelos, heroes of Mexican independence, were excommunicated. Juarez fought the Church in order to reform it. His lieutenant, Diaz, began as a radical; but growing older, he became conservative and robbed the peasants of 16,000,000 acres, and the nation of millions of dollars. For personal gain he sold Mexico to foreigners. The great majority of the American, British and Dutch mineral and oil concessions were usurpations; they were obtained by corrupt means, and the Diaz men pocketed the money. "The Church proved an essential ally in nullifying the democratic provisions of the constitution of 1857" (Gruening).

The Mexican clergy were "essentially partners of the Diaz

⁶ Essential books: *Mexico and its Heritage*, by Ernest Gruening; *Church and State in Latin America*, by Prof. J. Lloyd Mecham; *Porfirio Diaz* and other books by Carleton Beals.

system" (Mecham). Misery and oppression ruled the land during a great era of exploitation and wealth. There was absolute slavery in Yucatan, and peonage everywhere, while the government grafters grew rich and the Church prospered physically and materially. The masses of Mexicans were held in serfdom "by physical and mental control, by the army and by the clergy. . . . The Church became active and indispensable in the maintenance of industrial feudalism" (Gruening). The priests, as do so many ministers and rabbis, preached meekness, submission, slave morality.

No one can deny that when peonage and exploitation became unbearable and the masses in 1910 began their second great liberating revolution that the Church again supported the corrupt government. Madero formulated the great Plan de San Luis Potosi; it said nothing about the Church. Nevertheless, the hierarchy, fearing agrarian reform would despoil it of its great estates, and educational reform would secularize the schools, organized the National Catholic Party to fight against changing the social and economic order. Ambassador Harry Lane Wilson reported to the State Department, July 11, 1911: ¹ "The Roman Catholic Church and the party which takes its name have become violently antagonistic to Madero, and are busily engaged throughout the Republic in aspersing its motives, decrying its policies, and censuring the weakness and vacillation which is supposed to characterize his direction of affairs" (Gruening).

The Catholic Party put up signs: "Vote for God." The Madero party accused the clergy of using the confessional as well as the pulpit to intimidate voters; doctrine, dogma, faith and superstition to stop the vote for the revolutionary leader. When Madero was murdered, the priests of Oaxaca held a solemn mass of thanksgiving (Mecham, page 461). The vicious Victoriano Huerta came into power and the

¹ Quoted by Gruening.

Church went into politics on his side, and when the people again arose and overthrew Huerta they also attacked the Church, just as they attacked the Church in Spain on a dozen occasions. As in Spain the cry of atrocities arose. Father (later Bishop) Francis Clement Kelley of Oklahoma protested the murder of priests and nuns, but Secretary of State Bryan asked the American consuls to investigate and they reported the alleged atrocities propaganda lies. There was only one instance of personal violence, but it is true there were numerous desecrations of churches. General Alvarado defended certain acts, such as riding horses into churches, and smashing images, as an attempt to cure the pagan Indians of their religious superstitions.

Carranza the Liberator fought and defeated a coalition of the Huerta party, the wealthy, the aristocracy, and the Catholic Church. He signed a pact with General Villa:

The present conflict being a struggle of the impoverished against the abuses of the powerful, and understanding that the causes of the evils that bear down the country spring from pretorianism, plutocracy, and clericalism, the Divisions of the North and of the Northeast, solemnly pledge themselves to fight until complete banishment of the ex-Federal army, which shall be superseded by the Constitutional Army, to set up democratic institutions in our country, to bring welfare to labor, financial emancipation to the peasant by an equitable apportionment of land, and other means tending to solve the agrarian question, to correct, punish, and hold to their responsibilities such members of the Roman Catholic clergy as may have lent moral or physical support to the usurper. Victoriano Huerta.

The 1917 constitution aimed to destroy the power of the Church, to divorce it from politics, to drive it out of educa-

tion, to deprive it of property, and to force it to attend strictly to religion. But the extremists were so fearful that the Church would remain a power, they worded their clauses severely so that the 1917 constitution, going far beyond the 1857 constitution, would actually destroy the Church. But neither Carranza nor his successors enforced the constitution. Carranza was checked in his anticlericalism by pressure from President Wilson, who, being in politics and therefore forced to play the game, yielded to the pressure of the Catholic Church in the United States.

General Obregon continued the war against the hierarchy. He says in his book *Ocho Mil Kilometros en Campana* that the clergy deny mixing in politics although the proof is irrefutable; moreover, priests have led troops in the field. In the attack on Irapuato, the Huertistas lost 16 dead, many wounded, 60 prisoners; among the dead was the curate of Irapuato, and "among the prisoners two clerics of the Carmelite order who also had taken up arms to combat our forces" (page 237). Obregon's main policy was to drive the Church out of education. "The Church fights lay education," he said; "we are not unaware of the menace of these Catholic schools whose aim is to inculcate anti-government and anti-revolutionary propaganda, but at present there is not money enough nor facilities for the government to teach all Mexican children. It is preferable that they receive any instruction rather than grow illiterate." Bishops whom Gruening interviewed called secular education "atheistic, Protestant, socialistic, Masonic, Bolshevistic."

Freedom for Mexico meant labor unionization. A tremendous and successful movement swept the land, but certain Catholic leaders organized the *Sindicatos Católicos*, which were regarded as company or strikebreaking unions. In other words, the Mexican Catholic unions were similar to the Canadian Catholic unions, and unlike many unions

in the United States which are largely Catholic or led by Catholics.

On February 11, 1926, President Calles decided to enforce the Constitution of 1917 because, he said, the Mexican Episcopacy had grown disobedient. The Pope had written a letter February 2 (published April 19) saying "it is scarcely necessary for us to tell you how wicked are the regulations and laws invoked against the Catholic citizens of Mexico," but he warned Mexicans that the development of "united Catholic Action" did not mean violation of the Constitution; nevertheless certain leaders took it as a call to war. Under the heading "Viva Cristo Rey," Bishop José de Jesus Manrique y Zarate of Huejutla wrote a pastoral letter which resulted in guerrilla bands taking the field. On March 20 the Laredo-Mexico City train was held up, the conductor killed, and 100,000 pesos stolen. On April 20 the Guadalajara-Mexico City train was attacked and burned, fifty-four persons including women and children, almost all of them practicing Catholics, meeting horrible death, while the rebels were shouting, "Long Live Christ the King." The government charged the leaders of this attack were the presbyters Verga, Pedraza and Angulo, but the Church said these three accompanied the rebels as chaplains.⁸ The archbishop of Durango in February 1927 wrote a pastoral letter saying "To our Catholic sons risen in arms . . . we would say to you: be tranquil in your consciences and receive our benedictions." The pastoral letter adds that the archbishop has taken the matter up with the Pope, who was "moved on hearing the story of your struggle," and "we have seen him bless your admirable resistance, approve all your acts, and admire all your heroisms."

⁸ George A. Moreno, an American born citizen and Roman Catholic, was on the train. His life was spared because he was a Catholic; the man who spared him said he was a priest. Cf. *The Forum*, Sept. 1935.

The historians, Gruening, Mecham, Beals, all agree that the laws were oppressive and that the Church had every right to protest. "Prejudice, bitterness, passion, denunciation, violence animate both camps," concluded Gruening. "It is quite true that from the government's standpoint, the Mexican church has been persistently obstructionist, blocking lay education, blocking agrarian reforms, and misusing its power by invoking supernaturalism. . . . Its long record of avarice, materialism, and obscurantism has overshadowed the faithful and disinterested service of individual and unselfish and devoted priests. It is not surprising therefore that the pendulum of repression has swung far the other way."

Beals, who lived in Mexico before, during and after the war of the Cristeros, described numerous instances of "Catholic-baiting," the kidnaping of Knights of Columbus leaders, ransoms, excesses by the military, including murders, as a revenge for the attacks on innocent civilians in trains.

In 1928 when Obregon was assassinated by a religious fanatic, Calles said it was "direct clerical action," but this was not true. The murder was instigated by a nun who acted independently of any organization or member of the hierarchy. The bitter disputes which followed postponed the peacemaking which Ambassador Morrow (of the House of Morgan) undertook shortly after the good-will flight of aviator Lindbergh. But Morrow, thanks to his great desire to restore commercial activities, did succeed in making a compromise both for American interests and the Church; and in giving the latter corporate rights, the 1917 constitution was set aside. In June 1929 the first public masses were celebrated after a hiatus of three years. The Church prospered. By December 1, 1931, it had so far restored its power that in celebrating the four hundredth anniversary of the appearance of the Virgin of Guadalupe it put on such a super-gorgeous spectacle that anticlericalism was aroused through-

out the land, and laws restricting the clergy were enforced. Deportations began. Archbishop Ruiz, who had maintained that the Pope had a right to address pastoral letters to the Catholics in Mexico, was accused of being an undesirable foreigner owing allegiance to a foreign power, *i.e.*, the Vatican State, and sent to Laredo. The papal encyclical had protested the persecution of the Church, "an outrage against God, against the Church, and against the conscience of a Catholic people, is also an incentive to the subversion of the social order. . . ." President Rodriguez replied that "the present government was founded on principles that included the complete spiritual liberation of the people, and it enjoys the full support of the nation's masses, which will not tolerate dominion of a foreign power. If the insolent, defiant attitude shown in the recent encyclical continues, I am determined that the churches will be converted into schools and shops for the benefit of the nation's proletarian classes."

In 1933 crowds shouted "Down with God" when a speaker said, "God did not create man . . . God exists only in books, by which the priests exploit the poor! Man created God . . . Mexico wants no God. . . ." In Jalisco and Durango there were Catholic student uprisings in which two persons were killed. General Calles, now secretary of the treasury, blamed them on "the hidden hand of the clergy and other fanatics." Calles, himself a Catholic, campaigned for a year, setting up secular schools so that children could be removed from parochial schools. He said: "We must now enter into and take possession of the minds of the children, the minds of the young, because they do belong and should belong to the Revolution. It is absolutely necessary that we dislodge the enemy from this trench where the clergy are now, where the conservatives are now—I refer to education, I refer to the school."

Josephus Daniels, American ambassador to Mexico, ap-

proved this speech, whereupon *America*, the Jesuit weekly, demanded his recall.

Meanwhile Calles had grown rich, and his puppet successor, Rodriguez, one of the richest men in Mexico (thanks to the frontier gambling dens) was also being accused of betraying the revolution, whose first aim of course was agrarian reform. (Land is the problem in Mexico as in Spain.) In 1934 a new peasant revolt was imminent. The Morrow truce, Beals pointed out, helped the feudal Mexicans and foreign capitalist elements at the expense of the native proletariat and peasantry. Therefore General Lazaro Cardenas, a poor and honest man, was elected president. It was said at the time that he was Calles' left hand—whereas Rodriguez had been the right—but Cardenas showed Mexico he was not Calles' man at all, but a sincere leader who intended to carry out the promised long-delayed reforms. "Our Six-Year Plan is to transform and replace Capitalism," he had said in campaign speeches, and although he did not accomplish this, he did supply more land to the peasants and secular schools to the children.

In 1934 Archbishop Ruiz, papal delegate, and Bishop Manrique were accused of inciting armed rebellion; in 1935 the conflict between the Cardenas government and the hierarchy was intensified. In 1936 many teachers in the socialized schools were murdered; at Ciudad Gonzales in a fight between the authorities and a mob attacking a mission from the Ministry of Education 18 persons were killed, whereupon President Cardenas visited the town, called all the priests together and warned them from a church pulpit to leave the neighborhood.

It is not true (said the President) that socialistic education is an agent of dissolution in homes or that it perverts children and separates them from their parents. Socialistic education

will make men stronger and more conscious of their responsibilities. Neither the government nor the socialistic teachers occupy themselves in attacking religious beliefs.

Who, then, are responsible for yesterday's excesses? They are those persons who live in luxury and excite the working classes to fight with their brothers. They are contractors, principally owners of haciendas, who, in order to maintain inhuman systems of exploitation, provoke the spilling of blood. . . .

It has been said that these places (churches) have been erected to propagate truth, which is in contrast with the work of lies and provocation that emanated from this very spot yesterday. But I come to tell the truth. I know my obligations, and I do not forget my origin. . . .

In 1937 the government established a socialized peasants' commonwealth. March 18, 1938, the government announced the expropriation of the land and equipment of seventeen oil companies including Standard Oil, Sinclair and British Royal Dutch. The constitution of 1917, which gave the nation its subsoil riches, was at last being put into effect, and as a result a wave of patriotism engulfed the land.

A tremendous and significant change has taken place in the relations of Church and State in Mexico. Cardenas' friend, Archbishop Luis Maria Martinez, now directs a policy of peace with the government, and the result is the cessation of religious persecution, open churches, and toleration. Ambassador Daniels in 1939 reported that the churches were crowded and that the bishop of Tobasco, the last state to bar religious services, had returned to his diocese.

But the attack on the Mexican government, always initiated and financed by interests in the United States, continues. Hearst of course has always had a personal interest in attacking Mexico ever since the lands he obtained from the Diaz regime were put in jeopardy by a socialist govern-

ment which hated the vicious system which Hearst represented. The oil companies, the sugar men, the copper and silver kings, and the superpatriots behind whom they hide, as well as all the usual reactionaries who hate to see the success of a people's movement, are uniting to attack Mexico.

War with Mexico in order to get the oil and silver and sugar back for the American businessmen is proposed by Roy P. Monahan, a Wall Street lawyer and former commander of the Disabled American Veterans. He has attempted to get millions of signatures to a petition to Congress to use "our whole armed might." Ralph M. Easley, one of the nation's deepest reactionaries, and chairman of the National Civic Federation, once organized stockholders to fight Mexico. Martin J. Kennedy, New York Democrat, introduced a bill in Congress saying it was "imperative that proper and immediate remedial measures be instituted."

On the other side of the border the same type of reactionaries are working with representatives of Hitler and Mussolini to undermine the government. Anti-Semitism has been fostered by them; all the old religious difficulties are kept alive, and thanks to the money from the American exploiters and the Nazi and Fascist regimes, they maintain a large propaganda, hoping to split the labor unions, inflame the Church, arouse the peasants who still are poor and sometimes landless, a certain number of generals and governors whose loyalty is suspect, and unite all these reactionary or ignorant elements into a force which will establish another totalitarian regime.

The present situation shows more clearly than ever that the real war in Mexico is an economic war, that the real problem is the land problem—land for the farmer and oil and mineral land for the industrial worker. The religious wars were fought so long as the Church failed to declare itself on the side of the masses of people for the reform move-

ment, for the redistribution of wealth. Today the real war is on in Mexico, the war between a union of all progressive forces on one side, and a union of all reactionary forces on the other. It was the same in Spain in 1936, when the Church chose Reaction. In Mexico the Church today must choose between a similar Reaction and a similar Republic.

B. CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

The rest of Latin America is far behind Mexico in many ways, and notably in the relationship of capital and labor, religion and politics. Nowhere in Europe, until Hitler decreed forced labor, has there been such vile exploitation of the working people as in Latin America, and today in the majority of republics—some of them really dictatorships—the contrast between arrogant wealth and impoverished labor is stronger than anywhere in the world except India and China.

But Latin America also has begun to hear the rumble of a people seeking economic liberty, and although there is still no unified or armed movement, the enemies of the people are already organizing repression. Fascism of the Italian variety and Nazism from Germany are being propagated with foreign money and the money of the landowners, the beef barons, the oil kings, both native and foreign.

The worst possible thing that could have happened to the movement for liberty and democracy has been the victory of General Franco in Spain. Hitler and Mussolini not only won in Spain but also part of their pay will be the economic exploitation of South America, and for that purpose the Fascist idea must prevail there. It is now being pushed forward by three dictators.

Franco had not yet entered Madrid when his chief military advisor, General Wilhelm Faupel of the German army, pub-

licly declared that the domination of Latin America would be the role of the "new" Spain. The Nazi leader denounced the United States, not only for the Monroe Doctrine, but for Pan-Americanism and for the Lima conference of December 1938, where the proposal for democratic solidarity of the Americas was made. "There is but one danger to Latin-America," said the Nazi aide to Franco, "and that is the United States." He proposed the elimination of North American influence and the creation of Spanish America under Spanish domination.

The Franco penetration of Latin America is a Fascist penetration, supported by the Fascist axis, and based largely on commercial hopes. This movement has the support of the Spanish Catholic Church. At the same time the democratic movement in Latin America, led by the United States, has the support of the American hierarchy, which, compared to the Spanish, is liberal and progressive. Latin America therefore is becoming a battleground not only of political ideologies, but also of the Spanish and American hierarchies of the Catholic Church. Much depends on the policy the latter will adopt.

In the past the Church has had to accommodate itself to three policies in Latin America after years of conflict which were so overshadowed by the Mexican wars that they received little notice abroad. According to Meham the result has been: an independent Church in some nations, an established state Church in others, and an oppressed Church where the anticlericals have been successful. Anticlericalism has flourished in these wholly Roman Catholic countries for political and commercial rather than religious reasons.

In Argentina, Colombia (until 1936) and Peru the established Church of colonial days has survived largely; in Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Panama, and Uruguay, the relationship between Church and State is almost nonexistent; in Mexico

the Church was oppressed, but, says Mecham, "Citizens of the United States unacquainted with the facts, have been too prone to regard Mexico as the only rebellious member of the Catholic flock in Latin America. In Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Chile, the Church was attacked, sometimes with considerable animosity. In several of the lesser countries too, like Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras, the same vicissitudes were suffered. Although the attacks in Mexico were more bitter and the results more disastrous, to say that the Mexican remedies were more severe because the abuses were more glaring would not be absolutely true. In other countries the Church was quite as wealthy, relatively speaking, and as much of a political factor."

With the rise of social and economic reform the attack on the Church was natural because it was conservative, because it was "always identified with privilege and vested interests, because it was regarded as an obstacle to social and economic progress" and because of "the habit of the clergy of meddling in politics and assuming an inordinate supervision over the lives of their parishioners." Anyone who has visited Mexico and other Latin states knows that the clergy is different from the priesthood in the United States, just as it is different in France and Spain.

In Venezuela the Catholic Church is the state Church in everything but official name. Gomez removed the property ban and "the Church has been able thereby to build up large and valuable holdings of urban and country realty. . . . The exorbitant fee charged by the clergy has prevented thousands of unions from being blessed by the Church. The poor, ignorant and superstitious men and women dispense with the lay rites and live in open concubinage. In 1912 the civil register showed there were 23,937 legitimate births and 51,955 illegitimate births. Of 75,312 mothers, 51,580 were listed as unmarried" (Mecham).

In Colombia, Church and state were severed by the constitution of 1936 sponsored by the Liberalist government. Previously the concordat of 1888 had been in force. It established the Roman Catholic Apostolic religion, made the Church independent of the civil power, permitted it to acquire movable and immovable property (Article 5), established the Catholic religion in the universities and schools (Article 12), and Article 13 stated: "The government will prevent, in the conduct of literary and scientific courses, and in general, all branches of instruction, the propagation of ideas contrary to Catholic dogma and to the respect and veneration due the Church." No diploma could be obtained in Colombia by anyone who failed to receive Catholic instruction in the five universities.

In Ecuador, the Liberals having defeated the Conservatives at several elections, in 1929 freedom of religion was established, civil marriage made obligatory, and large estates valued at about \$20,000,000 taken from the religious orders.

In Peru the union of Church and State is the most absolute in Latin America; "perfect cooperation between the religious hierarchy and the political autocracy" exists, and "the strong tradition of clerical interference in political matter." One dictator after another has therefore made use of the Church in maintaining himself. Catholic authorities have admitted that the Church in Peru fails in its divine mission to inculcate real spirituality.

In Bolivia, as in Mexico, priests fought for liberty. Medina and Munecas are clerical and republican heroes. The Church is still established and the penal code produces the death penalty for those who "conspire" to establish another religion (cf. Mecham, page 223).

In Paraguay tyrants and dictators have made a political instrument for their own use out of the Church.

In 1923 Arturo Alessandri, Chile's first middle-class presi-

dent, urged the separation of Church and State for the benefit also of the Church because it had become too involved in politics. Bishop Valdivieso supported this view. In 1925 the Radicals and Democrats won and the separatists' move won. Property used for religion is tax exempt, but the vast lands and commercial properties used for profit, are taxed.

In Brazil the new policy, "a free Church within a free State," adopted in 1890, has resulted in the Catholic faith entering a new and more flourishing condition. Likewise in Uruguay the separation of Church and State has benefited both organizations.

In Cuba, during the War of Independence, which the nation won, thanks to the intervention of the United States, the state Church, which was that of Spain, opposed the will of the people. In revenge, the Cuban Republic disestablished the Church, and for years an attack was made similar to that in Mexico. Thanks to the actions of a non-Catholic, General Leonard Wood, who decided in favor of the Church in the great property dispute, the anticlerical movement was checked.

In Central America, concludes Meham, "religion has been one of the most disturbing factors in the history of the republics"; no one can deny clerical predominance in economic matters and in the political sphere, as well as the spiritual, and there have been "bitter, devastating, politico-ecclesiastical conflicts," no compromise on the religious policy, and the inevitable result has been "revolution and counter-revolution, repressive measures and retaliatory measures." The world press has been filled with these Latin American revolutions but has usually omitted the religious or clerical reasons behind them.

In the more enlightened Central and South American nations where the State has discovered the Church, both have

gained, and the Church, which at first fought desperately to maintain its political control, has become thankful in the end. However, in the more backward states the Church has either maintained itself in power or accepted divorce unwillingly. And now comes General Franco in Spain who not only destroys the Popular Front of 1936 but also the Republic of 1931, and restores the Church to power in Spain. This fact, and the facts of the Fascist axis plans in Latin America, produce important problems. Fascism is on the march. It is a menace to the United States. The Church—the Vatican and the American hierarchy—must face this New World crisis and make a choice between two opposed systems of government and life.

As Franco marched from Ceuta to Toledo, from Saragossa to the Mediterranean, the people of the United States were warned that the success of the German-Italian-Moor-Spanish-Fascist coalition would have immediate repercussions in South America, and that to protect the democratic ideal in the New World every man and woman who knew what America really meant must oppose Franco. The great majority did. Franco's only aid in the United States consisted of the German Bund, the Coughlinites, the Italian upper-class Fascists and a large part of the Catholic hierarchy and a little more than a third of the smaller part of the Catholic population.

Today, from Franco Spain, from Berlin and Rome, come reports of the plans to make South America Fascist. Cardinal Goma of course approves, and so far there is no protest from the Vatican—from the Vatican which has at times linked Fascism with Communism in listing its first enemy but never done anything against Fascism except when it has itself been attacked.

The war in Spain divided Latin America in exactly the same way as Spain was divided: the rich, the landowners, oil

interests, military, and others of the ruling class were for Franco, while the people, especially the enlightened people, the trades unions, were for the Loyalists. A large part of the press, owned by big money and corrupt, was for Franco. In the Church there was also a split, but not outwardly visible. As in the United States, the liberal and progressive priests did not dare open their mouths when the cardinals and archbishops officially supported the Fascists.

In Uruguay, Guatemala, Salvador and Nicaragua, "all ruled by petty tyrants who established their sway by force and murder," Franco was immediately recognized, reports Carleton Beals. The Latin-American dictators who controlled the press, radio and pulpit, gave orders which prevented the truth about the war in Spain from reaching the people. Peru actually jailed pro-Loyalists. Only in Mexico and Costa Rica, the more enlightened nations which enjoy free speech and a free press, was the sentiment pro-Loyalist. In many countries Germany has corrupted the press; in Peru it did so through heavy advertising. In Chile the Catholic organ *Union* prints all the glorious news of Nazi triumphs, supplied by a German propaganda service.

"In Chile, Brazil, Argentine and Mexico," continues Beals, "native Nazi movements . . . have taken up the Semitic witch-hunt. Though the Reich itself persecuted Catholics, in Latin America Nazi agents have cleverly lined up anti-Semitism with religious prejudices, making a Catholic crusade to save the Church. Humps of hate against the Jews as enemies of the Catholic faith are printed on the back of colorful prints of the Virgin." In Lima four leading dailies "have intimate relations with the Banco Italiano and are subsidized by heavy Italian advertising. Above all *El Comercio*, the predilect organ of the wealthy Civilista land-owning class and the Catholic Hierarchy, supports Fascism whole-heartedly . . . Numerous lectures in behalf of Fascism

are given in the National Catholic University . . . by the Italian minister and the papal nuncio."

The evidence of Franco-Hitler-Mussolini Fascism in Latin America is overwhelming. It is not all spies and plots and sensations, but a steady invasion which has grown powerful in the same way that the Axis has grown in Europe.

At the beginning of the Spanish War the San Sebastian Fascist organ *Unidad* published (January 22, 1937) an interview with General Yague (the butcher of Badajoz) by its correspondent, Adrian de Alkazarkivir. "Tell me," said the latter, "when we have triumphed, don't you think that we could manage to bring back into one great Empire all Spanish-speaking countries?" The general "bowed his head, he seemed to have a vision of all Latin republics already hoisting the glorious flag," then he replied: "Our brothers in America have never ceased to be Spaniards even though they have divided themselves from our government. When we attain supremacy, our Empire will become greater than ever it was."

Toward the end of the war the Franco government published its *Mein Kampf*, the program of government written by Jose Pemartin, national chief of university and secondary education, called *Que es "Lo Nuevo."* It lists the Fascist Internationale as consisting of Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal, Hungary and Japan, with Guatemala, San Salvador and Nicaragua as second-line or merely pro-Fascist states; and sympathy is expected from Brazil, Paraguay, Uruguay, Chile, Cuba, Argentina, Ireland, Belgium and Poland. The enemies of Fascism are Russia, France, England and those nations "behind these, the other anglo-Saxon nations still suffering from the opium of democratic parliamentarism" (page 116). Last of all is the United States. Says the Franco spokesman:

"If we leave Europe and take up a world point of view, we see that over in America there is most certainly reserved

to seemingly weak and backward Spanish America the same noble mission of Latinity in Europe: the conversion of North America to Catholicism.

"This will seem an impossible dream to some superficial minds. Nevertheless bear in mind how easily the material prosperity and the already low moral level of the United States have crumbled since the Wall Street crash of November, 1929. Think also of this—the United States is not a nation but a huge conglomeration of peoples and races, under the moral depression of the defeat which Japan will inflict on them sooner or later."

Finally (on page 137), Pemartin says it is a Spanish imperative to "extend and expand our great Latin, Christian, Hispanic culture and our political jurisdiction, above all, over the South American countries, of Hispanic soul and language."

Following Franco's victory, his press has openly attacked the United States, Pan-Americanism, the Lima congress, and the democratic movements in Latin America. On March 30, 1939, the State Department, Washington, reluctantly admitted that Franco was to be the driving wedge of the Fascist movement in Latin lands, as the Associated Press reported. Since then every news report bears out the Pemartin prediction of the Spanish aim to lead Latin America into Fascism. The Spanish Church of Cardinal Goma *et al.* supports this movement. The Vatican has felicitated Franco on his victory. Will it support his Fascist plans for Latin America? Will the American Catholic Church do likewise? The campaign of the reactionary leaders and press in favor of the immediate recognition of Franco was a disquieting sign.

CHAPTER 13

The Way Out of the Crisis

If Fascism goes down God's cause does down.—Cardinal Hinsley.¹

Spanish Fascism must be a Catholic Fascism.—Pemartin.²

The Catholic Church holds no brief for Fascism in any shape, form or fashion. The Catholic Church is the mother of democratic government.—Rev. John La Farge, S.J., associate editor of *America*.

If, in the eyes of millions of people Fascism and Catholicism should become identified, it might be very unfortunate for Catholicism in all democratic countries.—Dorothy Thompson.³

FROM the foregoing twelve chapters one fact emerges above all others: it is that there is a Catholic crisis throughout the world today, because the world is divided by warring ideas and that Catholics no less than Protestants, Jews, Moham-medans, and other sects, are taking sides. Many Catholic

¹ From an address by the Archbishop of Westminster, reported in the *London Times* and quoted in the *Christian Science Monitor*. Having been charged by a liberal Catholic reader of the proofs of this book with tearing this quotation from its context I give it in full as it appeared in the Catholic weekly, *Universe*: "To speak plainly, the existing Fascist rule, in many respects unjust, is one example of the present-day deification of Caesarism, and of the tyranny which makes the individual a pawn on the chess board of absolutism. I say that the Fascist rule prevents worse injustice, and if Fascism—which in principle I do not approve—goes under, nothing can save the country from chaos: *God's cause goes under with it.*"

² From *Que es "Lo Nuevo,"* the *Mein Kampf* of Fascist Spain, by Jose Pemartin, Franco's national chief of education.

³ *Washington Post*, and other papers, January 27, 1939.

spokesmen would have us believe the division is between Fascism and Communism, but the facts deny this theory. There are two wars going on today, the one on European battlefields, the other a war of ideas which has been called the struggle between Socialism and Capitalism, or Left and Right, or the Haves and the Havenots, or the Owners and the Dispossessed, and many others things, but it is fundamentally the same conflict. In the opinion of a great authority on this subject the conflict is not between Fascism and Communism but Fascism and Democracy. Speaking of these two systems of government, Mussolini predicted that year after year the war between them would grow more intense, and international. "The struggle between two worlds (Democracy and Fascism)," he said,⁴ "can permit no compromise . . . Either We or They."

Mussolini's viewpoint is supported by Hitler's own organ, the *Voelkischer Beobachter*, which said (June 8, 1939) of the war in Spain that it was "the decisive battle of the democracies against the authoritative states"; the German intervention was justified by the very existence of the Popular Front in Spain and its friendly relations with France and other democracies. Hitler himself (June 6, 1939) in one of his enormous orations admitted that the intervention was aimed against "the Christian democracies" primarily, not his usual bugaboo, Bolshevism.

It is true that great Catholics, intellectuals, mostly European (for example, Maritain, Mauriac, Duhamel), agree with Mussolini. It is also true that a few American Catholics have been brave enough to name the enemy. Father James R. Cox of Pittsburgh has done so, and the March, 1938, issue of *The Chronicle*, official monthly bulletin of the Church of Corpus Christi (which includes in its parish Columbia University), not only recognizes the danger of Fascism but

⁴ Palazzo Venezia speech, Rome, October 8, 1931.

also attacks the campaign of Red-baiting which obscures the real issue. "It has become all too apparent," it states, "that for most of our Red-baiting Catholics, Communism is a vague, indefinable bugaboo, broad enough to include everything progressive. A case in point is Tammany's Red-baiting appeal to Catholics last fall against Mayor La Guardia—so vicious that the Church authorities had to step in to repudiate it." The Protestant position is pretty well stated by the *Christian Century*⁵ which, replying to the Pope's appeal for a world crusade against Communism, said that for centuries the Vatican had rejected all Protestant overtures for co-operation or consultation about anything, and the 1936 proposal must be examined for its political as well as social objectives. It continues:

It is perfectly obvious that this is not simply a war against atheism and unbelief, in any sense in which non-Catholics understand those terms. . . . Sensible Protestants will have nothing to do with the Pope's furious onslaught on Communism until the false issues that it presents are clarified, it will be the more certain that they can have nothing to do with it.

The Roman Catholic fight against communism, as it is developing, is a campaign: first, for the power and privileges of the Roman Catholic church; second, for a fascist type of political and social structure; third, against freedom of opinion and speech; fourth, for an alliance of business with religion and the sanctification of the economic status quo. . . .

Not all American Catholics are in sympathy with all or any of these ends. It may reasonably be hoped that most of them are not. Certainly some of their most thoughtful and influential spokesmen have shown a clear understanding of the possibility of using denunciations of communism as a decent cloak in which to disguise a reactionary attitude toward all liberal movements for economic reform. . . .

⁵ November 25, 1936, page 1550.

America is not interested in an alliance with any enemy of Communism who is a friend of Fascism. The Vatican is a friend of Fascism. . . . The Pope's crusade sets up a false issue. . . . It is equally important that the blessing of no church that calls itself Christian be given to any program of tyranny, of economic oppression, of denial of civil and human rights. If the Pope wants to link arms with Fascist Mussolini on one side and with Fascist Franco on the other . . . he need not be surprised if the American Protestant responds to the invitation to join a crusade under his leadership. . . . "No, I thank you."

Another valuable opinion is stated by Miss Dorothy Thompson who, in asking for the repeal of the embargo against shipment of arms to Loyalist Spain, said⁶ that we must not listen "to those who tell us that the Loyalist government is a Communist government—which is simply a lie," and adds: "There is no danger of Communism in the world today. What is Bolshevism in the popular mind—the war against the traditional culture and spiritual values of the Western World, as well as the war against both human and property rights—is being carried on by the Fascintern."

The facts are so obvious that opinions are really not necessary. The Fascintern—Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain—is actually at war with the democratic nations and with all progressive and civilized ideas. It is war with guns and war with words. Fascism is on the march. Fascism is destroying culture wherever it conquers. Although Germany's pact with Soviet Russia in August 1939 broke the Fascist axis, the Fascist attack on civilization continues.

The Fascintern was founded in Germany in 1936. The theory that the world was divided into two camps, Communist and anti-Communist, was invented and propagandized

⁶ *New York Herald Tribune*, January 23, 1939, and other papers.

in Germany. Germany, having destroyed Democracy, refused to recognize it as a possible method of government.

Reaction has never ceased to threaten civilization, and at times it has triumphed. Pedants have argued that the Dark Ages were not so terribly dark after all, but that does not confound the historical fact that there are darker and lighter periods in world history, just as there are liberal and conservative victories at the polls in free countries, and that the pendulum swings from one side to the other. To the expressed fear that the world faces the danger of a return to dark ages if Fascism continues to win by bloodshed and reign by terror, Robert Briffault has replied: "We are already in the Dark Ages."

Enemies of the Catholic Church have accused it of being linked to reactionary movements in the past, to ideas and armies which have set progress back. Gregory VII called in the Normans. Hildebrand became a Church hero when he used foreign allies to destroy the great Arab civilization in Europe, but that civilization although not Christian was nevertheless great. Today, says a pro-Socialist and anticlerical writer (F. A. Ridley), "the destruction of modern civilization has . . . become a *sine qua non* if Rome is to survive the crisis that at present confronts her. As the Papacy has clearly realized, the victory of Socialism means the end of the Catholic World and of the Catholic Church." But just as the Caesars "averted dissolution by stabilizing decay," so it can be said of Fascism, the new ally of the Church, that it is attempting to save the *status quo* by stabilizing anticulture, antireason, obscurantism.

Fascism is Reaction armed with bayonets. Thus, we have always had Fascism, because we have always had reaction, and reaction has always found its bayonets, just as progress and civilization—the French Revolution, the American Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the revolutions in South

America and elsewhere—have at times found bayonets. The issues in the past may not have been as clearly drawn, but today Fascism, in fighting Liberalism and Democracy, is admittedly aiming to destroy the present civilization of the world.

In justice to the Church, any discussion of its relation to Democracy must be prefaced with the explanation that the word Liberalism, which is so generally used as an alternate word for Democracy, has a special meaning to Catholics. The great Leo XIII declared⁷ that "the main principle and foundation of liberalism is the rejection of the divine law . . . It (Liberalism) rejects and destroys all authority and divine law. . . ." Pius XI wrote: "Bear in mind that the parent of this cultural Socialism is Liberalism, and that its offspring will be Bolshevism." Cardinal Merry del Val once referred to "that moral pestilence known as liberalism," while more recently Dr. Denis Fahey, C.S. Sp., stated⁸ that "Liberalism is a sin . . . Liberalism is a sin of the mind and a supreme insult to God . . . The direct result of liberalism is anarchy or tyranny," and the Rev. Kilian Hennrich preached⁹ that "Liberalism is one of the most sinister forces, because it prepared the way for all the other wounds," naming atheism, radicalism, secularism and indifferentism, which he also attacked.

"Liberalism" as used by Popes and prelates and by laymen in South America and in Europe frequently has a connotation which differs from that in the United States, Britain, and other countries. It usually is applied to anticlericalism and to that European Freemasonry which was decidedly

⁷ Pope Leo XIII, Letter to the Archbishop of Bogota, April 6, 1900.

⁸ Denis Fahey, *The Social Rights of Our Divine Lord Jesus Christ*, Browne & Nolan, Dublin.

⁹ Sermon delivered November 20, 1936, at the Church of Our Lady of Sorrows, New York City.

anti-Catholic. "Were the Church to accept or even to compromise with this kind of liberalism it would commit intellectual and moral suicide," says the foremost liberal Catholic in America, Monsignor John A. Ryan.

But the words Liberalism, Democracy and Progressive Civilization are themselves joined or used as synonyms in several great documents of the Catholic Church, and in notable statements of Popes and other leaders. First among the documents is the *Syllabus of Errors* which states plainly that *Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo, et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere*, which calls down anathema on those who affirm that the Roman Pontiff can reconcile himself with Liberalism, Progress and Modern Civilization.

The *Syllabus* also holds it an error that "every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason"; an error that "the church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power"; an error that "Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion."

It is a fact that American Catholics—and only Americans—claim that the *Syllabus of Errors* is not a law for members of the Church in any part of the world. Perhaps that is true. But a similar viewpoint is expressed in the *Manual of Christian Doctrine*, a textbook published by the Institute of the Brothers of the Christian Schools and used for the instruction of children. The 1926 edition was the forty-eighth, with the imprimatur of Archbishop (now Cardinal) Dougherty of Philadelphia.

114. (Page 132) Why is the (Roman) Church superior to the State?

Because the end to which the (Roman) Church tends is the noblest of all ends.

120. Has the State the right and the duty to proscribe schism or heresy?

Yes, it has the right and the duty to do so both for the good of the nation, and for that of the faithful themselves; for religious unity is the principal foundation of social unity.

123. What name is given to the doctrine that the State has neither the right nor the duty to be united to the (Roman) Church to protect it?

This doctrine is called *Liberalism*. It is founded principally on the fact that modern society rests on liberty of conscience and of worship, on liberty of speech and of the press.

124. Why is Liberalism to be condemned?

1. Because it denies all subordination of the State to the (Roman) Church;

2. Because it confounds liberty with right; 3. Because it despises the social dominion of Christ, and rejects the benefits derived therefrom.

If the aforementioned book is no longer used and if the foregoing principles no longer are taught, then it may be said that in the United States the Church has made a step forward in Democracy. But the Church is universal, and if it still teaches antidemocratic principles in other countries, it is another proof of the paradoxes and contradictions which make its policies difficult for outsiders to understand.

In Spain, as every educated Spaniard knows, the Church was in politics, was opposed to the Republic, was opposed to the separation of Church and State, and taught its communicants to vote against the republican parties which had separated Church from State.

Challenged by the Catholic press to produce evidence of antidemocratic teaching in Spain, John Langdon-Davies published extracts from *Brief and Simple Explanation of the*

Catholic Catechism by R. P. Angel Maria de Arcos, S.J.¹⁰
Here are the paragraphs dealing with liberalism and democracy:

Q. What are liberal principles? (page 400.)

A. Those of 1789; so-called national sovereignty, freedom of religious cults, freedom of the Press, freedom of instruction, universal morality, and other such.

Q. What consequences result from these?

A. Secular schools, impious and immodest periodicals, civil marriage, heretical Churches in Catholic countries, abolition of ecclesiastical immunities. . . . etc.

Q. What does the Church teach about these?

A. That they are most disastrous and anti-Christian.

Q. What more?

A. That they never can be accepted as good, and may be tolerated only for as long as and in so far as they cannot be opposed without creating a worse evil.

Q. Is every Liberal Government hostile to the Church?

A. Evidently, since whoever is not with Christ is against him.

Q. How do those sin who, with their vote or influence, help the triumph of a candidate hostile to the Church?

A. Usually mortally; and are accomplices in the wicked laws contrary to the Church, voted by their candidate.

Q. Can the Church take part in politics?

A. The Church can and must take part in politics when it is a matter of faith, morals, customs, justice, and the salvation of souls.

Q. Is there no grade of Liberalism which may be Catholic?

A. That is what its partisans claim; but the Church teaches that what is called Catholic Liberalism is not Catholic.

Q. Then there is no grade of Liberalism that can be good?

¹⁰ Imprimatur by Jacobus Vigo, S.J. Circular recommending book signed by the Archbishop of Granada and originally published by him in *Boletín Oficial Eclesiástico*, Vol. 54, page 28. Publishers: Administración del Apostolado de la Prensa. Mr. Langdon-Davies owns a third-edition copy which claims that hundreds of thousands of copies have been sold.

A. None; because Liberalism is mortal sin and anti-Christian in essence. (page 390.)

Q. Then whoever is liberal in politics sins?

A. Certainly; because in liberal politics there exists that Liberalism which the Church condemns.

Q. And if by "liberal" is understood something not condemned by the Pope?

A. Then he sins in calling himself liberal, knowing that the Pope condemns Liberalism. . . .

Q. Then a Catholic must be anti-liberal?

A. Without a doubt: exactly as he must be anti-Protestant or anti-Freemason; in short, against all the contraries to Christ and his Church. (pages 408-9.)

Q. What of Communism, Socialism, Modern Democracy, Anarchism, and the like sects?

A. They are contrary to Catholic faith, to justice, and to all virtue, and as such condemned by the Church.

Q. Do not they say that they want to root out from the world the abuses of the rich and to regenerate Society?

A. They say so; but their doctrines and works prove the contrary.

Q. To what do they pertain?

A. To Luther and other arch-heretics who, with the pretense of reforming the Church, teach and practise all kinds of vices. (page 419.)

The readers will note that it is Modern Democracy, not anticlerical Liberalism, which is here classed with Communism and Anarchism, Luther and heresy, and condemned by the Catholic Church of Spain. Moreover, the Jesuit priest adds (on page 421) that "the Liberal system is the weapon with which the accursed Jewish race makes war on our Lord Jesus Christ, on his Church, and on Christian people."

These shocking and mendacious statements sound unbelievable in America. But in England certain Catholic papers attacked Langdon-Davies for publishing them, and he in

turn sued them for libel, offered his documentary proof, won his cases, and used the money "to publish material which may assist the many sincere progressive Catholics in England." Commented the *New Statesman and Nation*:¹¹ "There are thousands of civilised tolerant Catholics here who have no idea what Rome means in countries where the population is uneducated and Catholicism politically powerful . . . The pretence that Catholicism is only fighting 'Communism' in Spain is exactly the same pretence as the anti-Comintern pretence of the German, Italian and Japanese governments that they oppose not freedom, but Communism. Goebbels was more honest when he used the same phrase as the Spanish Catholic Catechism. National Socialism, he said, stood to overthrow all the principles of 1789—liberty, equality, brotherhood."

It is also worth noting that the *Brooklyn Tablet*¹² wrote to *Life* that the statement making liberal voting a sin was "a blunt lie. Where is the proof for any such calumny?" The proof was found. But the *Tablet* did not withdraw its accusation, it merely said¹³ that "it appears" that there were "several other Catechisms" in Spain.

The liberal clergy, a minority, used the Catechism of Pius X; the reactionary clergy, a majority, used the Catechism of Fr. de Arcos and others. But if we disregard the Catechisms and look at the facts of history we find Franco and Cardinal Goma united in directing Spain after the Civil War, outlawing other sects, re-establishing the joint rule of Church and State, abolishing free education and destroying not only "liberalism" but also democracy. During the war Cardinal Goma appeared at the Eucharistic Congress in Budapest and declared (the translation is from the French

¹¹ November 20, 1937.

¹² July 12, 1937.

¹³ August 3, 1937.

Catholic paper *l'Aube*) that "the war must be ended, but without compromise or reconciliation! . . . It is necessary, in order to organize the country with a Christian constitution, to extirpate all the putrefaction of lay legislature. A regime of perfect accord between the Church and the State must be established. . . . The Nationalist Government . . . never takes a step without consulting me and obeying me." General Franco (according to *O Seculo* of Lisbon) declared in May, 1938, that "for Spain I want a unity of discipline and order like that which exists in Portugal . . . Spain will follow her example, vanquishing in a long and bloody war the common enemy, Asiatic Bolshevism, and all its allies, Democracy, Liberalism and Freemasonry." Other Spanish Fascist publications are filled with similar statements. The *Gaceta del Norte* of Bilbao, October 18, 1938, quoted the Bishop of Madrid-Alcala saying "it is impossible to tolerate democratic liberalism," and the Catholic publication, *Razon y Fe* of Burgos addressed Americans in these words:

Liberalism and democracy, that is, the regime of unconditional respect for the individual, is completely bankrupt. . . . The American nations have a sad experience of one hundred years of democracy. . . .

The Spanish war, what is it but a bloody though necessary correction of an incurable democracy?

In England also there are Catholic voices against the American definition of democracy. Hilaire Belloc believes that "the Catholic Church is in its root principles at issue with the civic definition both of freedom and of authority. For the purpose of the State, religion is either a universally admitted system or a matter of individual choice. But by the definition which is the very soul of Catholicism, religion must be for the Catholic, first, a supreme authority superior

to any claims of the State." And Father Fahey, who has called Liberalism a sin, and previously explained Liberalism in the papal sense, declares himself against our form of government—for, by and of the people. "Governments," he writes, "rule in the name of the people, and in the name of the people the most incredible and fantastic injustices are imposed. Such are the consequences of *liberalism* . . . Look, for one example, at the evil resulting from the freedom of the Press. How many souls are corrupted by reading bad newspapers and the immoral and impious publications which abound in every country? How many souls are eternally lost on account of the protection by which all literary, scientific and other productions are legally surrounded? How many souls at this moment damned would not be so, if this accursed freedom of the Press did not exist? It is the same with freedom of teaching. . . ."

It is only in the United States that the democratic principle is accepted wholeheartedly by the Catholic Church—as well as its twenty-one million Catholics. Occasionally you hear something like this: "It is high time we put aside this spineless, fact-ignoring piffle regarding 'free speech,' 'right of assemblage,' etc." in a letter from the American Association Against Communism, one of Father Curran's organizations; or hear a priest, the Rev. John F. O'Hara, president of Notre Dame University, say: "While democracy may favor self-development it tends to nourish a form of individualism that is destructive to society . . . Much as we love democracy, we must not blind ourselves to this very active danger which is inherent in our form of government. States may sin in this way just as much as individuals. . . ."

And the *Tablet* (Brooklyn, March 25, 1939) can seize upon a word of criticism by Dorothy Thompson to say that she "is to be commended. She now sees the light. She is not sold on the 'democracies.'" The *Tablet* is for everything

that is Fascist except the name Fascism. In fact, there are no self-acknowledged open enemies of democracy among American Catholics, as there are elsewhere. Even democracy's greatest enemies, the Catholic Fascists in North and South America, pretend to uphold the democratic principles. As for the Catholic population, it is in no way different from the rest of the people of the United States: it is so easily led and misled; it does not make up a majority of Coughlin's followers; it proved its democratic courage by voting against Franco or indifference to him, in a national poll; it has supported labor, and makes up the majority of the more liberal union, the C.I.O.; and it has usually joined in all minority movements for tolerance and good will.

The Catholic people are democratic, but the Catholic Church is authoritarian, a form of dictatorship not unlike many which have existed throughout the ages. The American Catholics do not ask for the reunion of Church and State, most of them do want religion taught in the public schools, although the founding fathers ruled against that, and all of them believe that the non-Catholic has the right to worship in his own way, although they doubt the chances of the latter in reaching heaven. The American Catholics subscribe to the fundamentals of democracy which have remained more or less intact since the days nonconformists and victims of religious persecution (as well as others, including debtors and jailbirds) fled to the New World to start a new life. But the same cannot be said for Rome. The Vatican today as yesterday has insisted, wherever it was strong enough, on a monopoly in education, special privileges, for the outlawry of Protestantism and other religions. Cardinal Mundelein could ignore the *Syllabus of Errors* but not Cardinal Goma. Cardinal Mundelein did represent democracy triumphant in the Catholic Church, but Cardinal Goma represents Fas-

cism triumphant in that same Church. And that is one reason why there is a paradox and a crisis.

"One thing, however, is certain even if only one," writes¹⁴ Prof. G. A. Borgese who believes that the second Counter-Reformation of Pius IX of *Syllabus* fame still goes on, "and that is that a reconciliation between the Roman Church and modern civilization—that is, democratic or liberal civilization in the meaning that we give to these words—is utterly impossible and that the very idea of such a compromise has been stifled irretrievably by the Church as anathema." In that "all human souls have equal dignity before God," then the Catholic Church is a perfect democracy, but if democracy and liberalism give each the right to think freely, "and to bring his own contribution to the progress of collective human life and to the advancement of knowledge—the concession of equal rights and equal dignity to all religious beliefs—then the talk that we hear so often and so insistently in these days about the Roman Church as a mainstay of liberalism, tolerance, and democracy is frivolous, futile, and dangerous, for there is always danger in obscurity and confusion of issues," says Prof. Borgese.

American—and probably British, French, Scandinavian, Dutch and Swiss—Catholics frequently affirm that there is only one universal Catholic Church and that there can be no differences between its theory and practice in one country and another. The denunciation of what was once called "Americanism" is supposed to have ended any possible discussion on the matter in the United States. And nevertheless the most obvious thing in the world is the difference between the Spanish Catholic Church (for example) and the American Catholic Church, one Church thoroughly Fascist, blessing and sanctioning Fascist murder and the other pro-

¹⁴ *The Nation*, March 11, 1939.

claiming its leadership in Democracy and condemning Fascism in all its forms. They are so different that in some respects they may be said to be antagonistic. Non-Catholics see in the present currents and countercurrents in the Catholic Church the possibility of a serious conflict—not a schism, perhaps, but a tug of war in which either the Right or the Left, the Reactionaries or the Progressives, will have to pull the Church into one road or the other. (Only a very few persons believe that the present crisis of the Church is one in which its existence and prosperity is at stake.)

Catholics have boasted and non-Catholic historians have admitted that the Roman Church has survived all other institutions. "She saw," wrote Macaulay,¹⁵ "the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical institutions that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot in Britain, before the Frank had crossed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished in Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul."

In a similar vein Cardinal Pacelli (at the Budapest Congress in 1938) taunting the enemies of the Church, cried out: "Where now are Herod and Pilate, Nero and Diocletian, and Julian the Apostate, and all the persecutors of the First Century? St. Ambrose replies: 'The Christians who have been massacred have won the victory; the vanquished were their persecutors.'" And the more prosaic *Catholic News*¹⁶ says merely that "despite the fact that many a time

¹⁵ Essay on Ranke's *History of the Popes*.

¹⁶ New York, Feb. 13, 1937.

the Catholic Church has seemed to be in peril, she always triumphs."

The Catholic Church has triumphed over men and ideas. It has survived Frederick Hohenstaufen and Galileo, Luther and Calvin, Voltaire and Rousseau, and today it is engaged, helped by the armies and ideologies of Fascism, in fighting many battles, including the heresies of Marx and Engels.

"Religion," Marx believed, "is the soul of soulless conditions, the heart of a heartless world, the opium of the people. The suppression of religion as the happiness of the people is the revindication of its real happiness." "Men must eat, drink and have shelter and clothing and therefore work, before they can struggle for supremacy or devote themselves to politics, religion, philosophy . . ." wrote Engels explaining the essence of Historical Materialism.

The Vatican officially has been fighting Socialism from its earliest days. It denounced Communism two years before the Communist Manifesto was published. "Communism," declared Pius IX (on September 11, 1846), "is completely opposed to the natural law itself, and its establishment would entail the complete destruction of all property and even human society."

In *Rerum Novarum*, the most radical encyclical the Vatican has ever issued, "the main tenet of Socialism, community of goods" was utterly rejected by Leo XIII as "contrary to the rights of mankind" and in *Quadragesimo Anno* the late Pope Pius XI, who announced the crusade against Communism, did make distinctions between that revolutionary ideology and moderate Socialist reform but concluded with this dictum: "No one can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a true Socialist."

It is upon the foregoing facts that a British Socialist spokesman¹⁷ comes to the following conclusions:

¹⁷ F. A. Ridley, *The Papacy and Fascism*.

1. Fascism and Catholicism are both anti-Socialist, anti-Communist and anti-Labour; for both the destruction of the parties of the Left is a *sine qua non* of their continued existence.

2. Both alike are authoritarian, and therefore anti-rationalist. Their common need is the entire destruction of the secular civilization of modern times, founded upon autonomous human reason. Both alike oppose and where possible, extirpate liberalism, democracy, free-thought and even Protestantism. . . .

3. Both are atavistic in their relation to culture. Both deny progress in explicit terms (cf. Pius IX and Mussolini *ut supra*); . . .

4. Both exalt the country and the peasantry against the town. . . .

5. Both alike repudiate "sweet reasonableness" and conversion by persuasion; both are persecuting creeds. . . .

6. Both are "Totalitarian" States—neither is "agnostic" or indifferent to any sphere of its subjects' lives—both alike claim to exercise control over every department of human life and activity. . . .

7. Both rest on, and culminate in, permanent dictatorships vested in an individual who embodies Tradition and is consequently unerring, as the Pope is infallible by virtue of the Vatican Decree. . . .

8. The common enemy of both systems is human evolution and its interpreter, human thought. . . .

It is evident from the above comparisons that Fascism and Catholicism are united by the two strongest forces which can unite either men or institutions, *viz*, a common world outlook and common enemies. . . .

In sharp contrast to this Socialist criticism is the Communist policy of the "outstretched hand" which seeks a compromise between Moscow and the Vatican. So far as the present writer knows no Catholic prelate, spokesman or pub-

lication has come out publicly in favor of this proposal, but Maurice Thorez, head of the Communist Party in France, and Cardinal Verdier, archbishop of Paris, have made statements which have kept the subject alive.

No one can predict the future relationship between the present antagonists, but the facts of the past show that despite almost a century of open denunciation by the Vatican, that institution has made amazing concessions to the Marxian idea. *Rerum Novarum* itself may be said to have been a papal answer to the great forward march of Socialism throughout Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, and *Quadragesimo Anno* despite its anathema of Socialism as well as Communism is certainly a long step in the socialistic direction.

It is clear that in its relationship to labor and the social problems of our times the Roman Catholic Church, which has as its motto the words *Semper eadem*, "forever the same," is making all the necessary changes which have marked its history in its relationships with governments and political movements. It has in the past faced the same questions which today confront the world, Left or Right, for the Haves or the Havenots, for the Owners or the Dispossessed, and while it has also taken backward steps—the most recent of which is the bloody one in Spain—it has usually followed the trend of the times.

It is this fact that makes the present liaison of Church and Fascism lose considerable of its menace. The Vatican throughout history has been known to make its alliances with whatever forces would best serve its purposes, and obviously any deal with the atheist Mussolini and the anticlerical Hitler as well as the pagan Mikado and the Spanish butcher is destined to fail.

That the Church enters into such deals with Fascism is no surprise. There is an old and all-embracing explanation of

general Vatican policy which is as true today as when it first appeared in the Bible and which has been restated by many Popes. In the encyclical *Immortale Dei* is the paragraph: "Jesus Christ has Himself given command that what is Caesar's is to be rendered to Caesar, and that what belongs to God is to be rendered to God"; the great Leo XIII pointed out that the Church has never neglected to adapt itself to the genius of nations, and the late Pope Pius XI, denying that the Church hampers political reforms, repeated in *Dilectissimi nobis* the policy of the Church "accommodating itself to all forms of government and civil institutions provided the rights of God and the Christian conscience are left intact." It has paid the Church to adapt itself to the policies of Fascist nations.

To the Church's critics this policy seems Machiavellian, the crudest form of opportunism, compromise raised to an exalted international place—or just the kind of politics which kings and dictators guided by egotism, greed or a power complex, instead of Christian morality, have been playing. To this charge the Church answers that all its acts are *sub specie aeternitatis*; the Vatican even admits mistakes—something a dictator must never do—but it plans to correct them and to act for the best, on the long road from today to eternity. It may be opportunism. It may be Machiavellian. But it is adapting the Church to the times, as it sees best. This may, of course, *sub specie aeternitatis*, prove to be the biggest mistake the Vatican has made in centuries. But it is a temporary—temporal—policy. In the course of time Fascism will disappear, but the Church, having made use of it for its own ends, will go on.

The well-intentioned reader must not forget that the Pope is still a prisoner. Many, including his immediate predecessor, were prisoners of the Italian state; the present Pope is the prisoner of Fascist ideology. Although the head of a free

state, he cannot defy dictators, denounce their Isms, formulate a new Christian doctrine against war at this time. Pius XI was also the prisoner of a twenty-year-old complex about Bolshevism. When he was papal nuncio in Warsaw during the war with Russia he was terribly frightened by the Soviet onslaught, and he became the world's most important anti-Communist. He was willing to join with all Red baiters, including Japan. In the last decade of his life his policies were more and more influenced by his Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacelli, whose elevation to the papacy broke a long-established tradition by which the political director of a Pope's temporal policy, as, for example, Rampolla, Merry del Val and Gasparri were not made Popes, or the dictators of faith and morals of the Catholic world.

Pope Pius XII has visited the United States and is aware of the prophecy of Cardinal Manning, that "the future of Catholicism is in America." The present Pope knows very well that the Roosevelt Administration counted heavily on the spirit of democracy of the Catholic laity and that the Catholic Church in the United States, despite the Leonine strictures which outlawed any changes or behavior which would make it differ from that in other countries, is by the innate spirit of its democracy considerably unlike the reactionary branches of the same international institution, the Canadian or the Spanish, for example. The future of Catholicism may lie in America because of the growing Catholic population, the large increase of bishoprics, the financial support of the Church which is said to be larger than that contributed by the rest of the world. But it may lie in America because America is the stronghold of democracy. American Catholicism is the Catholicism of the famous credo of Alfred Smith, presidential candidate of 1928, a credo which states that the *Syllabus* of Pius IX which is antiliberal, anti-democratic, and in a way anti-American, has "no dogmatic

force," as Cardinal Newman said long ago, and that the famous encyclicals which the Popes issue from time to time and which are regarded as law by the tens of millions of Catholics throughout the world, are not articles of faith, and therefore he, Smith the American, cannot accept responsibility for them. By the Smithian system of dialectics no Catholic need fight Socialism or Communism, or pay any attention to *Rerum Novarum*, *Quadragesimo Anno*, *Casti Connubii* (Chaste Wedlock), *Lux Veritatis* (Papal Supremacy; Infallibility in Faith and Morals), or the late Pope's utterances in favor of Franco Spain, if he individually disagrees. The American Catholic, according to its most important lay spokesman, can take it or leave it. However, no Catholic outside the United States has ever expressed the same views and remained in the Church.

The main affirmation by Governor Smith was in the absolute separation of Church and State. And that, incidentally, was one great work of the Spanish Republic of 1931. But the Church, its critics contend, would make Church and State one in America and everywhere if the former ever became strong enough to enforce its will on the latter. American Catholics deny this. And yet the examples throughout the world must support the theory that the Church intends to rule with the State. The latest proof is Spain. On March 13, 1939 (according to the secular press and the Rev. Manuel Grana, correspondent of the N.C.W.C. News Service, as published in the *Tablet*, Brooklyn, March 25), Franco, repaying the Church for its support, abolished the two articles of the Republican Constitution separating Church and State, Nos. 26 and 27; abolished religious liberty; restored the juridical possession of Church property; restored complete autonomy of the religious orders under ecclesiastical authority and the *status quo ante* Republic. This is called a

"religious rebirth" of the "Christian spirit." One may well doubt if the outlawed Protestant Christians will agree.

A notable British spokesman, Hilaire Belloc, favors the union of Church and State. He predicts "the necessary conflict between the civil state and the Catholic Church" in America, but does not predict the victor. But other authorities agree with Gino Speranza that no Church or sect can be "profoundly and intimately American which in its aspirations and ecclesiastical organization lacks the spirit of that republican Christianity which herein has been called the Religion of American Democracy." American democracy, despite the collapse of the economic system and the rise of the Fascist demagogues, despite the Coughlins and the Moseleys, will certainly persist for a long time to come, and it will shape and color men and institutions, the Catholic Church among others.

So long as America remains democratic it must be anti-Fascist. And so long as the Roman Catholic Church continues its liaison with the Fascist nations and ideologies, it makes explanations by the American Catholic Church read more like apologies. The relation, Catholics explain, is not a marriage of their Church to Reaction (or Fascism). It is merely a liaison. A liaison can be broken without a divorce—and there is no divorce in the Catholic Church, only annulment, which does not apply here since (it insists) it is not a marriage. It is an opportunistic illicit and temporary amour, with no love shown on either side. It is not even a *mariage de convenance* so well known to continental Europeans, so largely practiced and so generally denied in America or Britain.

If this liaison is to be dissolved it must be the democratic Catholics who force the issue: the Catholics in the Fascist lands have neither the liberty nor the courage to do so. Un-

fortunately there is also a considerable lack of the courageous spirit in the United States where liberal priests in private have said they were against Franco but refused to say so publicly, and where Catholic labor leaders, who are destined to play a great part in the struggle for the maintenance of democracy, are willing to utter general denunciations of Fascism and Nazism but unwilling to criticize their own Church for co-operating with them when it is opportunistic to do so.

In fact, it is this present American policy in the Church which permits one of its priests to be the nation's chief lie-monger, and somehow restrains the liberal priests one meets at labor meetings and in universities from expressing liberal views, and this has done much to make non-Catholic Americans doubt the professions of democracy by the official hierarchy. The Father Coughlins fill the air with their hatred and untruth; but the anti-Coughlinite priests remain in their ivory towers—unwilling prisoners.

This is indeed one of the most interesting paradoxes of the Catholic Church in America that in the land where more democracy and individualism exists than in most countries, there is such fear and conformity among the priesthood. The Catholic labor leaders are foremost in nonconformity. They did more than their share in the A. F. of L., and they are not only proportionately but also numerically in the lead in the C.I.O. It took considerable courage to create this new organization. The American press was (and is) generally against it, big business is against it, all the Fascist congressmen who represent money instead of the people are against it, and the Catholic press was against it until it realized that the majority of a suddenly successful movement was Catholic. The C.I.O. was and still is called communist, red, radical, by the lie-mongers, but the Catholic labor leaders never wavered. It was only when the same lie-mongers used the

same terms against the Spanish Republic, which had about the same proportion of Communists in its population as the C.I.O. has today, that those Catholic spokesmen in America, clerical and lay, who knew the facts and favored democracy, were afraid to open their mouths.

This fear of defying the reactionary elements in the Church in a country where such defiance is a commonplace and a tradition has been noted with regret by those who have been predicting that in the great international play of forces which shape the Vatican policy, the more democratic American ideas would prevail. Financially the Vatican depends on America, and while there is no intention at this point to enter into a controversy over the old saying that he who pays the piper calls the tune, in organized religion as elsewhere, it cannot be denied that the American voice today is loud in the Vatican. The real question is whether the voice that will be followed is Coughlin's or Mundelein's.

This great crisis in the Catholic Church which Spain brought to international attention is destined to deepen and spread as the conflict between ideas and intentions spreads. Spain was merely the battleground, the first battle, and it was not a religious war, as the Church claims, nor in a narrow sense a war for land for the landless, although that is closer to the explanation. It was the first battle of the greatest world war of all time, the war which Mussolini said was between Fascism and Democracy, between "We" and "They," between even greater elements—wealth, power, the status quo, ownership on one side, and the progressive civilization of the masses of people on the other. The word Fascism or Reaction may not quite cover all the elements on one side, and Democracy surely does not tell clearly what the opposition is, but these symbols will do for the moment. The question therefore naturally arises: was Spain a fair test of the Catholic position?

In Spain the false issue of religion was made the first issue by interested persons and organizations. Christianity, Catholicism, anti-Semitism, Communism, and other issues may be used in the present and future battles which the people of the world must fight before they can liberate themselves finally and divide the fruits of the earth and their toil among themselves. Some of the issues may be real, some mere dust in the minds of otherwise well-meaning people. But the issues will have to be met by the Catholic Church because it is still the biggest and most powerful institution in the world and because its choice will be important. Not vital, but important. If it chooses the Fascist side, as in Spain, it will merely delay the social and economic victory of the people, just as it has merely postponed it politically there; but if it chooses the democratic side, the side of the working class in Europe and the labor movement in America, it would hasten the day heretofore believed Utopian. If the Church continues its liaison with Fascism it must rise or fall with Fascism, a tragic truth which horrified Catholics are expressing today as they contemplate the murder and terrorism of the Franco regime in Spain. If the Church remains the ally of the Fascist nations, the present Fascist Axis led by an atheist, a Catholic baiter and an infidel emperor, it accepts their political and military fate and can hope for no quarter in the eventual triumph of the world's anti-Fascist forces.

PART IV

THE VATICAN SURVIVES GLOBAL WAR

CHAPTER 14

Catholics and the Post-Fascist Era

THE whole world now knows that the leaders of the Spanish Republic and the few statesmen and journalists who tried to tell the truth, were right when they said that the attack on Spain by the Fascist Axis, by the nations of the Anti-Komintern Pakt (Germany, Italy, Portugal, with only minor help from General Franco) was merely the first battle of a global war by which Fascism would seek to conquer both hemispheres.

That battle was lost. The Pope blessed Franco who in turn produced a fascist-corporative dictatorial state and murdered his enemies.

However, there is one fact about this prelude to the Global War which is worth repeating. The world has been told that the Spanish hierarchy supported Franco—although the Church itself is pledged to support only established governments and to oppose revolution—but this was a revolt from the fascist side and all sorts of apologies were made. Actually, it is a fact that the Basque clergy and all the priests who were friends of the humble peasants, stood by the Republic. Several were unfrocked for pleading the Loyalist cause. But these facts are of minor significance alongside the fact that one of the great cardinals of Spain, the Primate of Catalonia, was anti-Franco.

He was Cardinal Vidal y Barraquer, who died in the sum-

mer of 1944. In 1937 it was known that he alone had refused to sign the circular letter of the Spanish Bishops which contained falsehoods against the Spanish Republic. At that time the *London Times* (and temporarily the *New York Times*) correspondent in Spain, Lawrence Fernsworth, himself a good Catholic, pointed out that several Spanish prelates had refused to attach their names to a mendacious document. He was immediately attacked by Francis X. Talbot, editor, and Albert I. Whelan, managing editor, of the Jesuit weekly *America*, who wrote the *New York Times* saying that Cardinal Vidal y Barraquer was "mentally incapacitated," and in a sanitarium for nervous disorders.

This was not true. Mr. Fernsworth investigated and found the Cardinal sound in body and mind, but the *Times* suppressed this report, leaving the false statements by the editors of *America* to remain unchallenged in the record.

In 1939, when the Fascists had seized Spain, Cardinal Vidal y Barraquer returned to Rome and voted in the conclave which elected his colleague, Cardinal Pacelli, Pope Pius XII. But he remained in disfavor, and died in poverty, a refugee in a convent in Switzerland.

The case of Cardinal Vidal illustrates one of the most significant features of the Catholic crisis: it shows that so far as Fascism is concerned there has not been unanimity in the Vatican, and it also illustrates again the fear of the American press to publish the truth.

Another illustration involving an individual cardinal is even more significant, because it deals with the relationship of a Catholic leader to Fascism at the time of the Global War. As already noted (on page 325) the charge that the Catholic Primate of Great Britain had said that if Fascism goes under God's cause goes under, had been challenged, and therefore the quotation was given in full. There can now be

no doubt that Cardinal Hinsley at the time of the Spanish rebellion was on the fascist side.

In 1942 Quentin Reynolds, leading Catholic layman, published in *Collier's* a statement by Cardinal Hinsley in which he said: "A Catholic in America who would not give all aid to Russia is not true to his faith. I get impatient with Catholics who still look askance at our Russian brothers."

In 1943 the Primate declared Naziism "the arch-enemy of mankind" and added that "for Russia we plead daily and in our prayers after mass." When Cardinal Hinsley died (March 17, 1943) the news heads called him "Foe of Fascism."

Here we have an illuminating example of a change of viewpoint toward Fascism.

On the other side of the record we find the following documented facts:

"Mussolini . . . a gift of Providence, a man free from the prejudices of the politicians of the liberal school."—Pope Pius XI, February 1929.

"The Pope made it clear to Chamberlain the Vatican is hopeful of a Franco victory as a means of restoring Christianity to Spain."—*United Press*, January 14, 1939.

"World Catholics United for Franco."—*New York Times* headline, August 7, 1938.

"Boston Cardinal [O'Connell] Hails Franco Aims."—Headline March 19, 1938, over a statement endorsing the Spanish dictator as a Christian.

Pope Pius XII on March 7, 1941, "praised those who had fought for the Nationalists [in Spain], sent his apostolic benedictions to General Francisco Franco."—*New York Times*.

"Cardinal Hayes Says He Prays for Franco to Win in Spain."—*New York Herald Tribune*, March 24, 1938.

"Cardinal Back, Calls Il Duce 'Miracle Man.'"—*New York World-Telegram*, November 1, 1934—referring to Cardinal O'Connell.

"Cardinal Ascalesi, Archbishop of Naples, is reported to

have offered his resignation to Pope Pius XII. Allied officials have disapproved of him. The reason is that he was open in his support of Fascism. I have often seen Cardinal Ascalesi at Fascist functions. Placards used to be put up saying *Evviva il cardinale fascista*—Hurrah for the Fascist Cardinal.”—WOV broadcast by Tom Morgan, former Rome UP correspondent, July 7, 1944.

This list of evidence of support of Fascism by the Pope, the cardinals, and other leaders of the Vatican State and the Catholic Church could be extended to scores of pages. The anti-Fascists in the Catholic Church and State were in a minority, and they were usually afraid to speak out.

Anti-Catholics and Catholic-baiters have tried to use the foregoing facts for a thesis. They accuse the nation and church they attack of a great hypocrisy, of laying their bets on both the hounds and the hares, of an ancient policy of deception. But such a charge of subtlety and sinister intention falls to pieces compared to the open facts in the case. The Vatican, the Pope and the Church not only have a policy of adapting themselves to the politics of powerful nations; they are openly at war, if we accept the Clausewitz definition that war is the extension of diplomacy with other weapons, with one great force in world affairs, a rival international movement, Communism.

It is no secret that given the choice between Fascism and Communism, Catholicism has always chosen the former. That being true, it explains everything, from the concordats, the blessing of fascist weapons of war, the papal benediction on Franco who had employed pagan Moors (wearing the Sacred Heart of Jesus on their tunics) to murder Christians and good Catholics, the support of Mussolini and Hitler, and similar shocking events.

The N. Y. *Times* correspondent, Arnaldo Cortesi, rightly reported from Rome on October 1, 1936 that “Cardinal

Pacelli, Papal Secretary of State [and now Pope Pius XII] [left for the United States] . . . to enlist the support of President Roosevelt and the United States Government for the anti-Communist campaign the Pope has been waging for some time.

"The Holy See regards the spread of Communist doctrine as the gravest and most threatening danger hanging over the world and is anxious to awaken all countries to a realization of this threat. A sympathetic attitude by the United States Government toward the Holy See's efforts in this direction would be considered most valuable by the Vatican."

In other words, the Vatican was doing exactly what Hitler was doing with his Anti-Komintern Pakt: it was aligning the great powers of the world; Hitler for a war of guns and airplanes and tanks, and the Vatican for a war of words, propaganda, ideology.

Why need one go further to explain the relations of Catholicism to Fascism?

Such a policy of course involved the Vatican and the religion of which the Pope is also the authoritarian head. It involved the Church with the most brutal forces in history, the most pagan, anti-religious, un-Christian leaders, parties, and states. But this was the choice, and it was made openly.

As for Nazi Germany, the best excuse offered was that of a leading American Catholic layman. "We may sum up by saying that the Church has pledged itself not to interfere with the progress of Fascism in Germany," declared George N. Shuster, the present head of Hunter College, and one of the few who reviewed the first edition of this book fairly (and favorably). (Source: *The Commonwealth*, September 1, 1933.)

On March 2, 1939 Cardinal Pacelli, the most political of all the princes of the Church, was elected Pope by his colleagues. This in itself was politically significant. In modern times it has been one of the unwritten laws of the Vatican

that the politician remained Papal Secretary of State and the less worldly cardinal, whose life had been devoted almost wholly to faith and morals, became the Pope. Rampolla, Merry del Val, Gasparri and others are the historic examples. But times had changed at the Vatican also. It was now again a nation as well as a church, and it was a time of war.

Pius XII was hailed as the "Pope of Peace." In an article with this title a writer in the *Reader's Digest* (June 1939), the most circulated publication in the world—whose editorial policy was exposed in 1942 as not only reactionary but frequently fascist—declares that when Cardinal Pacelli was elevated "the democracies were pleased, but the totalitarian states were not." This is arrant nonsense. Spain, Portugal, corporate Austria, Fascist Italy and totalitarian Latin American states were highly pleased, and so were Papal Chamberlain Franz von Papen and others who formulated Hitler's foreign policies. Hitler had his differences with the Holy See, but no cardinal more than Pacelli agreed with the Hitlerian thesis that the first enemy was Communist Russia.

It would be more truthful to say that no totalitarian state was displeased with the new Pope.

When the Catholic dictators in 1939 attacked Catholic Poland, after having overrun Catholic and corporate Austria and murdered the devout Catholic dictator Dollfuss, the Vatican pursued its announced course; it declared and maintained its neutrality. It was truly neutral. But when President Roosevelt began arming the United States this "defense" program was clearly understood to be a defense against the Fascist states. From then on it can not be said that the Vatican policy of neutrality prevailed. Cardinal Dougherty, celebrating his fiftieth anniversary in the priesthood, warned his country not to involve itself in Europe's war, where "God will bring good out of evil." Cardinal O'Connell's war stand

had been eulogized by Roberto Farinacci, secretary of the Fascist Party and one of the more prominent brutes in Mussolini's immediate circle. Farinacci also boasted that "today the great majority of Catholics constitute a bloc in the Axis spiritual forces."

The President sent Myron C. Taylor to the Vatican as a special emissary, his personal envoy, and a few weeks before the Japanese and Nazis actually declared war on the United States the Pope refused the President's request that he declare the war against Naziism a just war. It was pointed out (*New York Times*, September 17, 1941) that "the Pope's reply was evidently so worded as in no sense to indicate favor toward the Nazis or opposition to the American attitude," but it was a definite refusal to accept the American viewpoint. At that time the Nazi legions were thundering on their way to Moscow, to Stalingrad, to the Baku oil fields and to the complete destruction of the communist experiment. In fact, that complete destruction was already being celebrated in fascist circles.

However, on Christmas day of that year, which was a few weeks after Pearl Harbor, with Britain and the United States linked desperately to the hard-pressed Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, the Pope presented five peace points, and while he concluded that "We love with equal affection all peoples without any exception whatsoever" he also stated more subtly that he would not accept the Axis bid that he support their "crusade" against Bolshevism.

In America the bishops who were for appeasement and peace at any price were the voices heard throughout the land.

Papal neutrality was reiterated in May 1942 when Pius XII declared his "absolute impartiality toward all the belligerents" and equal concern "with the courageous combatants." Said the Pope:

We make a warm, fatherly appeal to statesmen that they may not let any occasion pass that may open up to the nations the road to an honest peace of justice and moderation, to a peace arising from a free and fruitful agreement, even if it should not correspond in all points to their aspirations . . .

The destruction wrought by the war among the nations on the material and spiritual plane is all the time accumulating to such an extent that it calls for every effort to prevent its increase by bringing the conflict to a speedy end.

It was pointed out by the noted scholar, Dr. G. A. Borgese, that a few days earlier, April 20 to be exact, Father Coughlin in his fascist propaganda and seditious weekly *Social Justice* had made a very similar plea for the same sort of peace. Borgese underlines the "absolute impartiality" of the Pope and declares that it is on just that ground that his plea cannot be accepted, that the United States and its Allies were fighting fascism because it was evil, therefore were fighting a just war, and could not listen to anyone who believed both sides were equally good or evil. To Dr. Borgese this was the most modern proof that the old Syllabus prevailed, and that the Roman pontiff must never "reconcile himself with progress, liberalism and modern civilization."

The Pope repeated his "five fundamental points for the order and pacification of human society" in his Christmas radio broadcast of 1942, in which he also mentioned "a just wage which covers the need of the worker" and "an assured, even if modest, private property," but in addition to continuing his war against his old enemy, Russian Communism, Pius XII went even further:

Always moved by religious motives, the Church has condemned the various forms of Marxist socialism; and she condemns them today, because it is her permanent right and duty to safeguard men from currents of thought and influence that jeopardize their eternal salvation.

The tide of war turned at Stalingrad, and the Red Army, feared alike by the fascist nations and the Vatican, began rolling ceaselessly, inexorably, westward to Berlin. The comings and goings of Monsignor Spellman of New York were always reported as having to do with a mediation for peace, for a negotiated peace, which the Allies by now were committed to oppose.

The American troops invaded Italy; they demolished the famous Monte Cassino, the Allied airplanes dropped bombs on Rome's railroad yards, and by accident hit the buildings of the Vatican itself. The American troops landed on the beaches of Normandy and established General De Gaulle as provisional ruler in France. German Naziism was defeated as well as Italian Fascism and the Vatican realized this long before the military men knew or would admit it publicly.

New regimes were being set up, and when Fascism would be finally destroyed, every country in Europe would have a change in government. Catholic as well as non-Catholic and anti-Catholic countries would be changed, and in some nations there would be coalitions. In some nations it could be foreseen that Catholics and Republicans and Democrats and Socialists and Communists would contend at the ballot box and sit together in parliaments. The Vatican would survive the Global War and some of the Catholic political parties would not only survive it but in those countries where they had been victims of Fascism they would rightly claim a place of honor. The world would know again that it was not the Socialists whom Mussolini fought in 1919 (and whom he purposely confused with Communists in 1925 when he floated the Morgan loan in Wall Street) but the Popolari, or Catholic Party of Don Sturzo, his most powerful rival.

It may therefore be said that it was not for the purpose of merely renewing old strife, opening old wounds, repeating

an insoluble problem, but rather for the purpose of clearing the moral atmosphere for this future time when world peace would require all forces to cooperate, that farsighted men in Moscow early in 1944 began what the sensational (and always irresponsible and frequently abysmally ignorant) American press called an "attack" by the Communists on the Vatican.

The American press, after its long and unbroken record of falsehood and propaganda against the Soviet system which began in 1917, was overjoyed at a new opportunity to pit two great adversaries against each other. Every headline and every editorial egged on the Soviets and the Vatican to further conflict.

However, the dispute was dropped rather suddenly when it was discovered that its cause was nothing more than the republication by the Moscow paper *Izvestia* of a pamphlet published by the Foreign Policy Association of New York, a documented, impartial review of Vatican policies to which no person could object and which could not possibly cause a furore in the press.

In Moscow, however, publication is not irresponsible, and almost everything is done with a plan and a purpose. Moscow perhaps was hoping that by emphasizing the fascist relationship of the Popes, their State and their Church, at a time when Fascism was defeated and the political policies of the Vatican State and the Roman Catholic religion would have to adjust themselves to a non-fascist if not entirely an anti-fascist world, Pius XII would hasten his repudiation of his former collaborators and ease the way to collaboration with all the rulers of a really brave new world.

The American press had sensationalized a charge that Moscow was accusing the Vatican of fascism, whereas in truth Moscow was repeating the Foreign Policy Association booklet's statements such as the following:

(Mussolini) "The Papal record of practical statesmanship is less impressive. Granted that the Holy See is in Italy and must accommodate itself to Italian policy, it can only be regretted that its associations with fascism should have been so close. It was imprudent in the extreme, for Pius XI to rejoice over Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia, particularly after the attacks on the Church which immediately followed the Lateran Treaty . . ."

(Franco) "One could not expect the Church to support the Spanish Republic, but it is unfortunate that such wholehearted support was given to General Franco—all the more because Pius XI seems to have suspected the true situation . . ."

(The "Bolshevik Bogey") "One could not have expected the Church to look with favor on Soviet Russia, but one might have hoped for an earlier realization of where the graver danger lay for Europe and the world. One fears that in this case a zealot's conviction replaced statesmanlike objectivity . . ."

(Nazi Germany) "It might also be argued that, when the anti-Christian nature of Nazi Germany became as well understood as it was by 1937, the Church should have taken a more militant stand. The delicacy of the Pope's international position is obvious, but his mistakes in policy, some now tacitly and almost openly admitted by the Vatican, cannot entirely be excused or explained away . . ."

Of course, it is possible to interpret the Moscow "attack" as evidenced by the republication of this American pamphlet, as a sign of growing antagonism between the Socialist State and the Catholic State. Only time will tell.

In mid-1944, with the Global War lost to Fascism, moves for peace, all involving the Vatican or at least a Vatican notable, such as Count Enrico Galeazzi, head of the Italian Knights of Columbus, or the most noted Papal Chamberlain, Franz von Papen, were reported from Lisbon, Ankara, Stockholm and other places.

A real stumbling block was the Polish question. The small-town priest, Father Orlemanski, who went from Worcester, Massachusetts, to the Kremlin in Moscow and a meeting with Stalin, was promptly suspended by his bishop (and somewhat later, reinstated). The Polish question was drummed up more and more by not only the sincere friends of the Polish pro-fascist Government-in-Exile of London, but by the so-called "vermin fascists" headed by Coughlin and the twenty-six others who were not influential enough to escape an indictment for sedition, and all snipers and obstructionists and former appeasers.

The Allied Nations meanwhile, after consultation with the generals and admirals, had issued their unconditional surrender demands on Nazi Germany. On the second day of June 1944 the Pope made an Italian language broadcast saying that the insistence on unconditional surrender would prolong the conflict, and suggesting the possibility of an agreement with Fascism. Spokesmen for the Allied Nations agreed that the Pope's plea for Rome would be heard, the eternal city would not be made a battleground, but they declined the offer of a negotiated peace, agreeing that it would be the saving of Naziism.

The Allied landing on the Normandy beaches and their entry into Rome was a sort of answer to the Papal plan for a negotiated peace. However, the Communist regime in Italy, which the Vatican feared so much, failed to materialize. The Communists, who had not been a big party nor a big influence in those days before Mussolini seized power, did come back to Rome with greater prestige and they did participate in a coalition government, leaving the Vatican suspicious perhaps but no longer fearful. However, as the returned Rome correspondent Herbert J. Matthews clearly pointed out:

The Vatican is having to face what normally would be both a bitter and a dangerous situation, which is that of the triumphant Communists of Russia emerging as the greatest power in Europe and able to dictate peace terms to such traditionally Catholic countries as Poland. Moreover, the Vatican is seeing Russians at its very door, so to speak, with the Communist party under Palmiro Togliatti playing a dominant role in Italian affairs.

All this puts the Holy See in a potentially difficult situation and yet so careful have Signor Togliatti in Italy and Premier Stalin in Europe been that Vatican fears are being soothed. These leaders are giving all sorts of assurances, and so far as Signor Togliatti is concerned in a practical way, for he is trying sincerely to reach an understanding with the Christian Democratic or Catholic party and he is making some progress in that objective.

It is a fundamental policy of the church not to concern itself with forms of government. Its concern is with the rights of Catholics and their church. If those rights are guaranteed and that church is tolerated or supported it is agreed by everyone this reporter has been talking with here at the Vatican and in Rome that the church will find a *modus vivendi* . . .

The *modus vivendi* seems to have been found. No word of conflict between the Vatican State and the Italian State has disturbed the victorious nations as they concluded the war against Mussolini and Hitler and the lesser members of the Anti-Komintern Axe which had set out in July 1936 to conquer all of Europe for international fascism and had celebrated the first victory at Madrid in 1939. The Vatican, adapting itself to the genius of nations, had applauded that victory, and hailed its nominal leader, Franco, as one of its favorite sons and the Pope blessed Spanish soldiers in the Vatican. (On July 22, 1944 the New York newspapers pub-

lished an Associated Press radiophoto entitled "The Pope gives benediction to American soldiers in Rome.")

The sands of Naziism ran out. The great leaders of victory, Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, had pledged unity and a hard and just peace. There was no longer a question of punishment for Germany, but a question of national guilt, of the guilt of a whole people, which would justify contemplated measures making it impossible for the old ideological, political, financial and industrial forces to reconstitute a Nazi state. Before the war was completely won there was already dissension on how severely to treat Germany.

Sixteen hundred religious leaders of various denominations addressed a memorial to Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin, cautioning against involvement with any religious establishment, and warning against the Vatican specifically. The memorial, which caused widespread disputes, said in part:

Establishments of religion, however widely representative, however exalted, have no place at the council tables of the State . . .

During the papacy's abstention from overt political activity, in the half century between 1870 and 1929, it was blessed on its ecclesiastical side by an extension of its power and influence on a scale unparalleled in any previous age. Its growth was particularly marked in non-Roman Catholic countries, where it enjoyed the most harmonious relations with existing free cultures.

It is tragically significant that when, in 1929, the papacy re-entered the political field, it did so in alliance with enemies of those very cultures in which its church had thrived. As a political power it gained its first fatal successes in treaties of friendship with fascist powers. Supporting Mussolini in Italy, Dollfuss and Schuschnigg in Austria, Hitler in Germany, Franco in Spain and Pétain in France, the papacy has thrown

its weight into the scales of the present human struggle on the side of the enemies of democracy . . .

We therefore oppose any attempts under whatever formula to involve the free democratic states in any deal in which the Vatican State or its representatives or the representatives of any Protestant or Jewish establishment of religion, has part or place, either as principal or mediator. (Among the signatories: President Mackay of Princeton Theological Seminary; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Dr. Harry F. Ward, Pierre van Paassen, Colonel Raymond Robins, Prof. James Luther Adams.)

In a reply the noted Catholic editor, Michael Williams, after denying that the Church had sided with Fascism, insisted that "the Holy See pursuance of what all Catholics everywhere among all nations and races, regard as its divine commission to teach and propagate the religion of Christ," would make whatever deals it could with temporal powers, secure governments, regardless of type or kind. Williams points out that when in the early 1920's the Vatican tried to make a "deal" with Soviet Russia and Pius XI was criticized, he replied that he "would negotiate with the devil himself if the good of souls demanded such action." (As the present author remembers the incident, the quotation referred to Mussolini, not Russia.) Mr. Williams also spoke of "religious-political relations," claiming that the Church has always pursued them, and would continue to do so.

In his next appeal for a negotiated peace the Pope on March 18, 1945, condemned the Nazi race dogma, but he continued to preach forgiveness.

The next political action of the Catholic Church in America was a statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference on the eve of the San Francisco Conference, issued in the name of the archbishops and bishops of America, informing the world of five objections, the most notable of

which was the Crimean agreement on the Polish question. Editorially the *New Republic* declared that:

The fears of the bishops are largely unjustified. We do not believe that events in Russia for the past decade and more warrant the fear that the division between the Russian system and that of the Western world is growing deeper; on the contrary, the gap is beginning to be bridged. The real division is between the fascist countries and the rest of the world, and it is a matter of regret that in nearly every one of these countries, the Catholic Church plays a powerful part in support of the fascist dictator. But in any case, it is disturbing to see a representative body of prelates entering into a public controversy on a strictly political, sectarian set of issues. No church can do anything but harm when it plunges headlong into politics, as the Catholic Bishops are doing.

No disinterested person can doubt that the Catholic Church, as well as the Vatican State, is in politics. The Vatican State is a political organism, like any other state—and incidentally, the ruler of that state, who is the Pope, is also an authoritarian ruler.

Originally, this book concluded with the statement that "if the Church continues its liaison with Fascism, it must rise or fall with Fascism." In the six years which have passed since that prediction was made the Church at first made its liaison tighter, but when the crucial test of war arrived, it was wise enough to engage in a certain repeated neutrality which, while angering the democracies, did succeed in loosening the bonds with the dictatorships.

This neutrality has saved not only Rome physically, but the spiritual power of the Holy See. The Pope rules the Vatican State, revived Catholic Parties in many parts of the new Europe participate in national affairs, and communicants in America continue to be the chief financial and spiritual support of the Church.

The Church has survived. But it cannot be said that in Italy, or in France, or in Bulgaria, or in Yugoslavia, or in Poland, or in Austria, or in Hungary, or in any other country where it was once either absolute and part of the fascist dictatorship, or the official religion, or the major religion, or a formidable power, that it has retained all of its powers or its prestige or all its honor.

The Catholic Church and the Catholic State have like most nations had considerable losses in the Global War.

Whether these losses will ever be regained cannot be predicted here. But what can be said with certainty is that the unbroken policy of the Church, which is like the will to live of an individual, is bound to assert itself, and that it will continue to make whatever compromises and deals are necessary to survive. And those same apologists who protested that the Church was not married to Fascism (and therefore could not divorce itself from Fascism, as the liberals urged) but was merely engaged in a necessary political liaison with Fascism, may one day soon be explaining that the Church was now in friendly relations exclusively with the democracies, with liberalism itself, and even engaged in a liaison with red (but victorious) Russia. Or we may see the Vatican aligning all reactionary states for a new attack on the first Socialist nation.

That is a matter of speculation, a matter for history to state as fact or falsehood. But it is a speculation which is justified by the facts of the history of our time, facts which the author believes are recorded in the foregoing pages without prejudice, and despite censorship.

Index

A

Adair, Dr. Fred L., 228
 Advertisers, 185, 207
 Aikman, Duncan, 291, 298
 Allen, Jay, 285
 Allen, Robert, 182, 207
 Ameche, Don, 125
America, 9, 23, 24, 45, 87, 109, 123, 130, 157, 160, 197, 222, 225, 246, 253, 301
 American Civil Liberties Union, 63, 77, 157, 227, 238, 293
 American Committee on Maternal Welfare, 228
American Hebrew, 110
 American Legion, 77, 118, 149, 171, 177
 American Medical Association, 52, 59, 228
 American Newspaper Guild, 104
 Amlie, Hans, 72
 Anaconda, 144, 146
 Anderson, Maxwell, 87
 Annenberg, M., 34
 Anti-Semitism, 20, 22-47, 101-129 (Coughlin); 162, 175, 193, 289, 292, 315, 334, 350
 Arcand, Adrien, 288, 297
 Associated Film Audiences, 235
 Associated Press, 70, 187-189, 266
 Austria, 269-278

B

Baldwin, Roger, 157, 158
 Balla, Valentine De, 33
 Balliett, Carlton, Jr., 87
Baltimore Sun, 70, 202-205

Banning, Margaret Culkin, 124
 Barnes, Dr. Harry Elmer, 19
 Baruch, Bernard, 72
 Bates, Ernest Sutherland, 138
 Bauer, Otto, 27
 Beals, Carleton, 306, 313, 322
 Belloc, Hilaire, 34-38, 131, 336, 347
 Bergner, Elizabeth, 221
 Bernard, Representative, 132
 Bethune, Ade, 124
 Birchall, Frederick, 251
 Birth Control, 52, 55-59, 94
 "Birth of a Baby," 61, 173, 228-233
Blackfriars, 251
 Bleakley, Wm. F., 177
 Bliven, Bruce, 98
 "Blockade," 224
 Bloom, Congressman Sol, 67
 Borah, Senator, 138
 Bouton, S. Miles, 203
Boxoffice, 234
 Bray, William, 175
 Breen, Joseph I., 90, 217, 223, 234
 Breuer, Bessie, 86
 Bridges, Harry, 105
 Briffault, Robert, 329
 Britt, George, 121
 Borgese, Prof. G. A., 339
Brooklyn Eagle, 206
Brooklyn Tablet, 22, 28, 29, 43, 60, 83, 101, 117, 121, 206, 208, 225, 335
 Brophy, Charles, 159
 Brophy, John, 124
 Broun, Heywood, 125, 150, 186, 207
 Buell, Raymond L., 139
Buffalo Courier-Express, 81
 Bund, German-American, 116, 118, 175
 Burnham, Philip, 16, 124
 Butler, Gen. Smedley, 67

C

- Callahan, Wm. M., 83, 120, 160, 164
Camden Courier-Post, 200
 Campbell, J. I., 71
 Canada, 287-300
Canadian Forum, The, 289
 Capone, Al, 67
 Cardenas, President, 313
 Carey, James B., 122
 Carlin, Col. W. J., 84
 Carney, Wm. J., 160
 Carney, Wm. P., 195-197, 199, 245, 254
 Catholic Action, 52, 53, 221, 222
 Catholic Book Club, 3
 Catholic Canadian Fascism, 79-80, 287-300
 Catholic Church and Austria, 269-278
 Catholic Church in Canada, 287-300
 Catholic Church and Germany, 257-262
 Catholic Church and Italy, 262-265
 Catholic Church and Japan, 266-268
 Catholic Church and Latin America, 316-324
 Catholic Church and Mexico, 300-316
 Catholic Church and Portugal, 278-286
Catholic News (N. Y. C.), 54, 137, 159, 194, 225, 233, 251
Catholic News (St. Louis), 82
 Catholic Pressure, 48-76, 86
 Catholic Pressure on the Movies, 211-239
 Catholic Pressure on the Press, 184-210
 Catholic Pressure in Politics, 130-153
Catholic Review, 203
 Catholics and Civil Liberties, 77-99, 169, 170
 Catholics and Political Machines, 155-183
Catholic Times, 28, 29, 100
 Catholic Union & Times, 81
 Catholic War Veterans, 159
Catholic Worker, The, 42, 83, 109, 119, 120, 123, 160, 164, 225
 Catt, Carrie Chapman, 139
 Chaillaux, Homer, 71
 Chamber of Commerce (U. S.), 71
 Chaplin, Charles, 239
 Charles, Pere Pierre, S.J., 30
 Chauncey, Clarence M., 67
Chicago Daily News, 210
Chicago Tribune, 101, 285, 301
Christian Advocate, 20
Christian Century, The, 51, 53, 153, 238, 327
 Christian Front, The (various organizations), 43, 84, 96, 106, 121
 Christian Science, 174
Christian Science Monitor, 325
 Christians, Geo. W., 67
 Christie, A. E., 228
 "Church and State in Latin America," 180, 306, 317-320
Church Times, 19
 C.I.O., 15, 69, 104, 122, 158, 160, 169, 245, 291, 299, 348
 Cisneros, General Hidalgo de, 253
 Cobb, Irvin S., 67
 Coblentz, E. D., 189
Commonweal, The, 4, 7, 14, 16, 23, 48, 101, 109, 116, 119, 123, 160, 162, 272, 297, 301
 Communism, 9, 18, 19, 20, 27, 35, 45, 64, 66, 102, 106, 177, 181, 191, 226, 233, 259, 294, 326, 327, 341
 Cooper, Kent, 188
 Cort, John C., 124
 Coughlin, Father, 15, 20, 22, 30-33, 43, 67, 71, 96, 100-129, 150, 175, 193, 268
 Cox, Father Ignatius W., 52, 65
 Cox, Father James R., 326
 Cox, Dr. Walter, 228
 Cross, Jeremiah, 177
 Crotty, Jos., Jr., 231
 Curley, Archbishop M. J., 137, 138, 151, 203-205
 Curley, Governor, 67
 Curran, Rev. Edw. Lodge, 65, 67, 69, 72, 74, 105, 121, 178, 185, 225, 267

D

- Dallas News*, 210
 Daniels, Josephus, 312

Day, Dorothy, 124
 Deatherage, George, 71
 Derleth, August, 124
Der Stuermer, 25, 31
 Descendants of the American Revolution, 67
 Desvernine, Raoul, 75
 Deverall, Richard, 43
 Dewey, Thomas, 179
 Dickstein, Congressman, 72
 Dies, Congressman, 72, 73, 89
 Dilling, Mrs. Elizabeth, 53
 Dineen, Mgr. J. P., 56-59
 Dollfuss, Engelbert, 271
 Donahue, Bishop S. J., 152
 Donohue, Capt. T., 57
 Dougherty, Cardinal, 92, 202, 331
 Drinkwater, Father, 101
 Duff, Charles, 249, 284
 Duplessis, M., 80, 292, 294

E

Editor & Publisher, 194-208
 Educational Films, 228
 Elliott, Dr. J. L., 85
 Ernst, Morris, 157
 Espy, Willard R., 204
Esquire, 188, 207
 Ethiopian War, 15, 262
 Evans, Hiram Wesley, 71

F

Fahey, Rev. Denis, 31, 112, 330, 337
 Fairchild, Lambert, 67
 Fascism, 4, 5, 7-21, 106, 240
 Faulhaber, Cardinal, 10, 262
 Fay, James H., 172
 Feehan, Mrs. Chas., 61
 Fernsworth, Lawrence, 195, 197, 200, 245, 252
 Film Survey, 235
 Films for Democracy, 233
 Fitzgerald, F. Scott, 218
 Fleisher, Dr. M. S., 63
 Flynn, Errol, 53
 Fodor, M. W., 132, 270, 274
 Foley, Samuel J., 173

Fonda, Henry, 224
 Ford, Henry, 104, 105
 France, General, 4, 9, 11, 35, 39, 140, 190, 195, 240, 252, 316
 Frankfurter, Felix, 72
 Franklin, Jay, 181
 Freemasonry, 39, 40, 146, 280, 299, 309, 334
 Freud, 89

G

Gallup Poll, 11-14, 22, 23, 50, 61, 85
 Gannon, Bishop J. M., 186
 Gerson, Simon W., 64
 Gibbons, Bishop, 63
 Gilbert, Dudley P., 70
 Glennon, Archbishop J. J., 62
 Grana, Rev. Manuel, 251, 346
 Grimley, Father B., 100
 Gruening, Ernest, 306, 309
Guild Reporter, 187
 Gunther, John, 273

H

Hague, Mayor, 15, 79, 122, 156, 160, 163, 205
 Hall, Helen, 138
 Hallowell, Thos. J., 67
 Hammond, Ogden H., 70, 74
 Hanna, Archbishop, 92
 Harris, Basil, 70
 Hart, Merwin K., 70, 73
 Harvey, Geo. V., 73, 74, 118
 Hayes, Cardinal, 55, 172
 Hayes, Helen, 87
 Hayes, Dr. James, 231
 Hays, Will, 215, 219
 Hearst, 34, 49, 67, 101, 160, 188, 189, 230, 315
 Hecht, Ben, 87
 Hemingway, Ernest, 199
 Hills, Laurence, 190, 210
 Hinkle, John, 124, 195
 Hinsley, Cardinal, 264, 325
 Hitler, 24, 35, 46, 100, 102, 132, 184, 257
 Hogan, Frank J., 116
 Hollywood, 212, 216, 238

Hollywood Reporter, 225
 Holmes, Dr. John Haynes, 20, 84, 91
 Holy Name Society, 33, 117, 153, 155,
 157, 158, 160, 174, 216, 227
 Hopkins, Secretary, 72
 Howard, Roy, 194
 Howard, Sidney, 220
 Hull, Cordell, 55, 105, 139
 Huston, John, 223

I

"Idiot's Delight," 217
 Innitzer, Cardinal, 15, 271, 276, 277
 Institute for Propaganda Analysis, 89
 International Catholic Truth Society,
 15, 65, 74, 148, 178, 185
 Isaacs, Stanley, 64
 "It Can't Happen Here," 219, 239

J

James, Edwin L., 200
 Jesuits, 8, 19, 63, 132, 157, 213, 243,
 277
 Johnson, Dr. Alvin, 30
 "Juarez," 223
 Jung, Harry, 66

K

Kann, Maurice, 234
 Keith, J. E., 289
 Kelley, Bishop F. C., 308
 Kelly, Col. Hugh, 159
 Kelly, John E., 67
Ken, 188, 207
 Kent, Rockwell, 138
 Kernan, Rev. W. C., 96
 Kluckhohn, Frank, 199
 Knights of Columbus, 53, 58, 61, 82,
 85, 88, 118, 141, 153, 225, 227, 231,
 239, 295, 304, 306
 Knopf, Mrs. Blanche, 89, 90
 Kuhn, Fritz, 67, 69, 71, 122
 Kuhn, Loeb & Co., 105, 111-113

L

La Farge, Rev. John, S.J., 325
 La Guardia, Mayor, 69, 74, 172

Lamont, Corliss, 178
 Lamont, Thomas, 67
 Langan, James F., 61
 Langdon-Davies, John, 332
 Larsen, Roy E., 173
 Latin America, 316-324
 Lawson, John Howard, 224
 Legion of Decency, 52, 61, 212-213,
 216, 223, 227
 Lehman, Governor, 53, 63, 175, 178
 Lehmann, Leo H., 211
 Leo XIII, Pope, 9, 131, 330, 341, 344
 Lerner, Max, 139
 Levin, Meyer, 207
 Lewis, John L., 69
 Lewis, Sinclair, 219, 239
 Liberalism, 330-334, 336, 337
Life, 61, 173
 Lindbergh, Chas. A., 134-136
 Lindlof, Johanna M., 84
 Lippmann, Walter, 139
 Loewenstein, Prince, 10, 261, 275
London Times, 69
 Longo, John, 158, 160, 170
 Lord, Rev. Daniel A., 124, 213
 Lyons, J. J., 14, 15

M

MacArthur, Charles, 87
 McCabe, Joseph, 95, 171
 McClafferty, Father, 223
 McCormac, John, 294
 MacDonald, George, 217
 MacGowan, Gault, 67, 69
 McGuire, Father O. B., 251
 McKenzie, A., 223
 McNaboe, J. J., 64, 73, 177
 McNicholas, Archbishop J., 81, 216
 McWhirter, Felix M., 71
 Magner, Mgr. James A., 14, 15
Manchester Guardian, 270
 Marcossou, Isaac L., 67
 Maritain, Jacques, 25, 326
 Martin, Olga J., 215
 Marx, Marxism, 5, 8, 9, 35, 217, 251,
 269, 341
 Matthews, Herbert L., 195, 197, 199
 Maurer, Dr. O. A., 138

Mauriac, 17, 326
 Maverick, Maury, 180
 Mayer, Louis B., 219
 Mecham, Prof. J. Lloyd, 180, 306, 317, 320
 Medical Bureau (Spain), 60, 63
 Mencken, H. L., 69, 204-205
 Methodists, 18, 55, 182
 Mexico, 49, 223, 300-316
 Meyer, Eugene F., 193
Michigan Catholic, The, 126
 Miller, Webb, 190
 Molloy, Bishop, 75
 Monks, Noel, 101
Month, The, 30
Montreal Herald, 292
Montreal Star, 292
 Mooney, Archbishop, 124, 126, 127, 150
 Moseley, Gen. Van Horn, 67, 68, 71, 287
Motion Picture Daily, 225
Motion Picture Herald, 225, 233
 Mowrer, Edgar A., 182
 Mumford, Lewis, 19, 20
 Mundelein, Cardinal, 54, 116, 139, 140, 161, 338
 Murphy, Attorney General, 72, 180
 Mussolini, 15, 17, 26, 35, 48, 67, 102, 131, 184, 262-265, 282, 326

N

Nation, The, 39, 45, 74, 121, 139, 235
 N. C. W. C. (National Catholic Welfare Conference), 58, 87, 92, 195, 213, 245, 346
 Nemours, Duchess de, 38
 Neville, Robert, 192
 Nevin, Dr. Mendell, 59
New Republic, The, 65, 83, 92, 171, 274
New Statesman & Nation, 335
New World, The, 109
New York Herald Tribune, 58, 91, 139, 190, 192, 206, 210
New York Post, 34, 64, 70, 75, 91, 168, 200
New York Sun, 67, 69, 151, 205

New York Times, 34, 57, 73, 75, 91, 124, 139, 153, 193, 195, 231, 245, 251, 282, 302
New York World-Telegram, 64, 121, 150
 Niebuhr, Dr. Reinhold, 19
 Noll, Bishop John F., 53
 Nye, Senator, 138

O

O'Brien, Justice H. A., 73, 118
 O'Brien, Dr. W. A., 231
 O'Connell, Cardinal, 151
 O'Connell, Jerry, 136, 142-147, 157
 O'Connor, Mrs. Jessie Lloyd, 187
 O'Connor, John J., 103, 172
 O'Day, Caroline, 86
 O'Flaherty, Liam, 227
 O'Keefe, Ruth, 124
 O'Leary, Mrs. A. P., 86
 Owsley, Alvin, 67

P

Pacelli, Cardinal (See Pius XII)
 "Papacy and Fascism, The," 341
 Paramore, Edward, 218
 Parran, Surgeon General, 231
 Parrott, Ursula, 86
Patriots Digest, 68
 Patterson, Paul, 203
 Patton, R. Caldwell, 67
 Paul, Helen, 85
 Pearson and Allen, 182, 207
 Pearson, Drew, 182, 207
 Pegler, Westbrook, 125, 205, 207
 Pelley, Wm. D., 67
 Perkins, Secretary Frances, 72
Philadelphia Inquirer, 34, 194, 206
Philadelphia Record, 91, 193, 200
Pittsburgh Catholic, 160
 Pius XI, Pope, 9, 22, 44, 52, 132, 212, 254, 259, 330
 Pius XII, Pope (Cardinal Pacelli), 130, 181, 241, 254, 258, 340, 345
 Poletti, Charles, 175, 179
 Poor, Henry Varnum, 86
Portland Oregonian, 210

Portugal, 278-286
 Press, American, 33, 34, 51, 75, 105, 145, 174, 184, 210, 245, 310
 Press, Catholic, 11, 13, 23, 40, 42, 43, 45, 109, 123, 129, 141, 229
 Price, Byron, 188
 Prince, Frederick H., 70
 Protestants, 17, 18, 70, 72, 174, 181, 213, 222, 238, 309, 327
Protocols of Zion, 30, 31, 37, 40, 103, 108-110
 Pulitzer, Jos. F., Jr., 193

Q

Quadragesimo Anno, 9, 341, 346
Queen's Work, 124, 160, 164-167
 Quigley, Martin, 213, 220, 225, 233

R

Radio, 211
 Reed, Senator D. A., 67
 Reid, Mrs. Ogden, 58
 Reinhardt, W., 223
 Reissig, Rev. Dr., 197
 Remarque, Eric Maria, 218
Rerum Novarum, 9, 341, 346
 Rich, Maj. Wm. Lathrop, 67
 Ridley, F. A., 329, 341
 Robb, Arthur, 194, 208
 Roberts, Kenneth L., 67
 Robles, Gil, 244
 Rogers, Judge H. W., 66
 Roosevelt, Eleanor, 60-62, 86
 Roosevelt, F. D., 38, 115, 119, 139, 150, 181, 282
 Rutherford, Judge, 116, 117
 Ryan, Monsignor John A., 31-33, 101, 150, 331

S

St. Apollonia Guild, 59
 "St. Joan," 221
St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 193, 210
 Salvemini, Gaetano, 263, 282
 Sanger, Margaret, 56-59, 95
 Saunders, D. A., 51

Saturday Evening Post, 71
 Scanlan, Patrick, 43, 44, 61, 101, 117, 121, 123
 Schrembs, Bishop, 231
 Screenwriters Guild, 239
 Sedgwick, Ellery, 74
 Seipel, Monsignor, 269
 Seldes, Helen Larkin, 140
 Shahn, Ben, 65
 Shaw, Bernard, 221
 Sheean, James Vincent, 239
 Sherwood, Robert, 217
 Shuster, George N., 9, 116, 274
Sign, The, 26-28, 130
 Simpson, Kenneth L., 69
 Sinclair, Upton, 91
 Skillin, Edward, Jr., 124
 Skirball, Jack, 228
 Socialism, 8, 25, 271, 329
Social Justice, 28, 101-107, 119
 Sorenson, C. E., 67
 Southworth, H. R., 74
 Soviet Russia, 23, 32, 80, 191
 Spellman, Monsignor, 256
 Smart, David, 188, 207
 Smith, Alfred E., 37, 75, 98, 100, 108, 116, 119, 345
 Smith, Father E. Harold, 48
 Smith, Gerald L. K., 67, 102
 Spanish War, 4, 5, 17, 20, 25, 36, 46, 50, 184, 200, 250-255
 Stahlman, James G., 194
 Stern, J. David, 34, 193, 200
 Stimson, Henry L., 138
 Stires, Bishop E. M., 75
 Strand, Paul, 237
 Sturzo, Don, 275
 Sulzberger, Arthur Hays, 193, 197-199
 "Syllabus of Errors," 331, 339, 345
 Sylvester, Harry, 124

T

Tablet (London), 133
 Talbot, Father F. X., 9, 222, 252
 Tammany, 64, 156, 168, 171
 Taylor, Edmond, 101
 Taylor, Winchell, 225

Teeling, William, 16, 52, 130, 264, 266
"The Informer," 227
Thomas, Norman, 85
Thompson, Dorothy, 139, 205, 207, 210, 325, 328
Thorez, Maurice, 343
Thorning, Father J. F., S.J., 74, 100, 193, 240, 253, 285
Time, 87, 91, 118, 126
Tobin, Mayor, 225
Toledo Motion Picture Council, 230
Toledo Times, 82
Toomey, Father J. A., S.J., 87, 91

U

United Catholic Organizations Press Relations Committee (UCOPRC), 87
United Press, 190
Untermeyer, Samuel, 72

V

Van Doren, Irita, 91
Van Kleek, Mary, 138
Van Schmus, W. G., 225
Verdier, Cardinal, 101, 343
Villeneuve, Cardinal, 80, 293, 294, 296
Voice, The, 124

W

Wagner, Robert F., 124
Wallace, Wm. R., 122
Wall Street Journal, 70
Wanger, Walter, 224, 226
Ward, Dr. Harry F., 19
Washington Merry-Go-Round, 182
Washington Post, 193, 210
Washington Times, 139
Watson, Thomas J., 67
Watts, Richard, Jr., 227
Wecht, Judge Milton M., 25
Weer, William, 206
Weidman, Jerome, 94
Weizmann, Chaim, 38
WEVD, 96
Wheeler, Senator, 143-147
White, Wm. Allen, 194
Williams, Michael, 4, 45, 87
Winchell, Walter, 72
Winrod, Gerald, 67, 71
Wittels, David G., 168
WMCA, 96, 116
Woodlock, Thomas F., 70
Woll, Matthew, 75

Y

Ybarra, T. R., 282
YMCA, 59, 226, 299
YWCA, 54, 226, 230, 299